

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 134--82nd Congress

Chapter 373--1st Session

H. R. 3709

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Digest of Public Law 134	1
Index and Summary of H. R. 3709	2

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 134

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION ACT, 1952: Includes funds for the Bureau of Employment Security, which has as one function the program for farm placement of migratory, foreign, and other farm workers; for the revision of the consumers' price index by BLS; funds for Food and Drug Administration; Office of Education, including the vocational educational program; Public Health Service; and Social Security Administration. The act contains a provision restricting the filling of personnel vacancies that may occur during the fiscal year and providing that when the total number of personnel subject to the provision has been reduced to 90 percent of the total number provided for in the 1952 budget estimates, the restriction shall cease to apply. Provides for specific reductions in various appropriations contained in the act. Provides that agencies included in the act shall periodically submit to the Appropriations Committees and CAO a daily trip record showing the use of their passenger cars operated in D. C. Provides for personnel employees in the ratio of 1 to every 115 employees, with certain exceptions. Also limits the use of funds for informational and publicity work.

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF HISTORY ON H. R. 3709

February 8, 1951	Hearings: House, H.R. 3709 Department of Labor
February 13, 1951	Hearings: Part 1, House, H. R. 3709 Federal Security (exclusive of Public Health Services)
February 14, 1951	Hearings: House, on H. R. 3709
February 21, 1951	Hearings: House, on H. R. 3709 - Part 2 (Public Health Services)
April 13, 1951	Mr. Fogarty, from House Committee on Appropriations, reported H. R. 3709. Report 322. Print of bill as reported.
April 17, 1951	House began debate
April 18, 1951	House concluded debate and passed H. R. 3709 with amendments.
April 19, 1951	Referred to Senate Committee on Appropriations. Print of bill as referred to Senate.
June 6, 1951	Senate reported H. R. 3709 with amendments. Senate Report 386. Print of bill as reported.
June 7, 1951	Senate began debate on H. R. 3709
June 8, 1951	Continued debate
June 11, 1951	Senate continued debate
June 12, 1951	Continued debate
June 13, 1951	Senate continued debate
June 14, 1951	Senate concluded debate and passed H. R. 3709 with amendments. Print of bill with amendments of the Senate numbered. Senate conferees appointed.
June 22, 1951	House conferees appointed
July 11, 1951	House received Conference Report 694
July 12, 1951	House rejected Conference report 694.
August 16, 1951	House received 2nd Conference Report 887
August 17, 1951	House agreed to Conference Report 887.

August 20, 1951

Senate agreed to Conference Report 887.

August 31, 1951

Approved: Public Law 134

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY,
AND RELATED INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIA-
TION BILL, 1952

APRIL 13, 1951.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State
of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the
following

R E P O R T

[To accompany H. R. 3709]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in
explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the
Department of Labor, The Federal Security Agency, The National
Labor Relations Board, The National Mediation Board including
The National Railroad Adjustment Board, The Railroad Retirement
Board, and the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

The budget estimates forming the primary bases of consideration
by the Committee will be found in the budget for 1952 on the following
pages:

	<i>Pages</i>
Department of Labor.....	718 to 736, inclusive
Federal Security Agency.....	182 to 238, “
National Labor Relations Board.....	115 to 116, “
National Mediation Board.....	116 to 118, “
Railroad Retirement Board.....	120 to 122, “
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	101 to 102, “

The Committee also considered a budget amendment contained in
House Document 66 relating to the Federal Security Agency.

The detailed tabulation at the end of this report reflects each
amount included in the bill for 1952, the corresponding budget esti-
mate, and the amounts available for the fiscal year 1951, with
appropriate comparisons.

SUMMARY OF ESTIMATES AND APPROPRIATIONS

For all agencies and items, grand total appropriations of \$2,642,279,-961 are recommended, a reduction of \$89,973,799 below budget estimates of \$2,732,253,760. For all items, including appropriation of railroad retirement taxes, appropriations in the bill represent a net increase of \$255,087,897 above 1951 appropriations to date of \$2,387,192,064. As explained under the Railroad Retirement Board heading later herein, the increase of \$174,995,076 shown for the board distorts the over-all picture in terms of charges on the general revenues and in the summary table below that appropriation has been omitted from the totals for purpose of more realistic comparisons.

Therefore, excluding the Railroad Retirement Board item, total appropriations recommended are above 1951 appropriations by \$80,092,821 but when elimination of contract authorizations granted in 1951 is figured in, there is a net reduction below 1951 of \$22,657,179. In terms of comparisons with current funds it should also be noted that funds for emergency school aid in Federally impacted areas are \$55,500,000 above 1951. That program appears in this bill for the first time.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

Department or agency	Appropriations, 1951, as reduced by Sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952	Committee bill, 1952	Bill compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1951, as reduced by Sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952
APPROPRIATIONS					
Department of Labor-----	\$230,906,360	\$231,289,000	\$223,506,500	—\$7,399,860	—\$7,782,500
Federal Security Agency-----	1,705,220,080	1,874,887,260	1,793,226,461	+88,006,381	—81,660,799
National Labor Relations Board-----	8,562,500	8,582,500	8,300,000	—262,500	—282,500
National Mediation Board-----	1,498,500	1,198,000	1,150,000	—348,500	—48,000
Railroad Retirement Board ¹ -----	(438,004,924)	(613,000,000)	(613,000,000)	(+174,995,076)	(-----)
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service-----	2,999,700	3,297,000	3,097,000	+97,300	—200,000
Total appropriations, as above (see footnote)-----	1,949,187,140	2,119,253,760	2,029,279,961	+80,092,821	—89,973,799
CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS					
Federal Security Agency-----	102,750,000	-----	-----	—102,750,000	-----
Total, above items (see footnote)-----	2,051,937,140	2,119,253,760	2,029,279,961	—22,657,179	—89,973,799

¹ Not included in totals of table. Budget and committee bill for 1952 propose to place this item on an indefinite appropriation basis.

It is next to impossible to show substantially greater savings in this bill because of the large amounts over which the committee has virtually no control. The one item for public assistance grants is 61 percent of the total shown in the table above; basic control of that appropriation is in the formula of the Social Security Act requiring the Government to match State expenditures. The limitations on the committee in this respect are further pointed up when it is noted that in only the four items for public assistance, emergency school aid, hospital construction, and employment security grants, \$1,665,000,000, or 82 percent of the total, is included.

Reference to the tabulation at the end of this report will show that the committee has imposed reductions all along the line, reflecting

determination to effect retrenchment wherever it was felt that could be done. In some instances cuts have been made in meritorious programs and activities which would justify a higher level of support were it not for the lack of Treasury dollars. The committee was importuned from many sides to increase appropriations above the budget but in no case did the committee feel warranted in acceding to those demands.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

For all items the budget recommends \$231,289,000, a net increase of \$382,640 above comparable 1951 funds aggregating \$230,906,360. The bill includes \$223,506,500, a reduction of \$7,782,500 below estimates and \$7,399,860 less than 1951. Of the bill total \$195,560,000, or about 88 percent, is embraced by two items, grants to states for administration of the employment security program, \$165,560,000, and \$30,000,000 for Federal employee injury compensation payments. A Federal tax of three-tenths of one percent is levied on payrolls of covered employers to finance administration of the employment security system and that tax is expected to exceed the appropriation in 1952 by about \$97,000,000. The injury compensation fund implements specific provisions of law obligating the Government to make payments adjudicated under the provisions of the law. The remaining \$27,946,500, or 12 percent of the total, is recommended for all other activities. As shown by the detailed tabulation, a number of substantial cuts have been made reflecting the committee's determination to reduce expenses in every instance where that appeared possible.

The following summarizes the situation:

Item	Estimates	Committee bill		Bill compared with--	
		Amount	Percent	1951	Estimates
Grants to States for employment security program.....	\$169,560,000	\$165,560,000	74	-\$6,579,000	-\$4,000,000
Employees injury compensation fund.....	31,000,000	30,000,000	14	+2,000,000	-1,000,000
All other items.....	30,729,000	27,946,500	12	-2,820,860	-2,782,500
Total appropriations.....	231,289,000	223,506,500	100	-7,399,860	-7,782,500

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses.—The sum of \$1,425,000, a reduction of \$50,000 below the estimate, is recommended for this item which covers the top executive staff of the Department, an office dealing with international labor matters, and various central management and housekeeping services. All funds requested for additional positions have been deleted, and since no allowance is made for such mandatory items as within-grade salary advancements, some retrenchment below the current level will be necessary.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses.—A total of \$1,650,000 is recommended, a reduction of \$100,000 below the estimate and \$71,160 below 1951 funds. The budget of \$1,750,000 provides for legal services for the entire Department and includes slightly over \$1,000,000 for the Fair

Labor Standards and Public Contracts Acts administered by the Wage and Hour Division. The Committee has made a substantial cut against the Wage-Hour Division budget, and since the workload of the legal staff goes somewhat hand in hand with the work of that Division, a companion reduction has been made in the Solicitor's budget.

BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

A reduction of \$78,000 below the estimate and currently available funds of \$766,000 has been made by the committee, allowing \$688,000.

The equivalent of 10 full-time personnel is assigned to international labor matters with a budget of \$48,000. The Committee is not convinced that this much is needed, particularly in view of the sizeable staff provided in the Secretary's appropriation exclusively for international labor matters, and accordingly has reduced the Bureau's allotment by \$26,000. Another activity is the work of registering data filed by labor unions under provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act. The work is highly routinized and with procedures improved through experience in the past few years the reduction of \$8,000 against this allotment can be absorbed without impairing the operation.

The remaining \$44,000 of the cut has been imposed against activities in the field of development and promotion of sound labor legislation and administration. No cut has been made in the safety, youth employment, or physically handicapped activities. The Committee feels that the Bureau can without serious effects forego some of its promotional activities.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses.—For salaries and expenses of the bureau including the Veterans Employment Service, \$4,635,500 is recommended, a reduction of \$839,500 below the estimate of \$5,475,000. The cut applies to the estimate of \$1,583,000 for the Veterans Employment Service, allowing \$743,500 for that service. No reduction has been imposed against the other activities of the Bureau because of its work in conjunction with the State employment services in the defense manpower program.

The Federal Veterans Employment Service is charged with responsibility for functional supervision of veterans placement work in the state employment services. The state employment services are required by law to maintain adequate specialized facilities for effective job counseling and placement of veterans. In addition to this supervisory responsibility, in recent years when unemployment was somewhat of a problem and veterans were looking for work the Federal Veterans Employment Service conducted active job-finding on its own with funds appropriated for employment of additional staff to do this under supervision of the Federal veterans employment representative in the states. The budget for 1952 projects the current organization of 262 positions, of which 16 are in Washington and 246 in 52 States and territories. In some of the larger industrial states there are several assistant veterans representatives; in others, there is only one representative.

Provision for this supplementary job-finding was justified when there were more veterans seeking work than there were jobs avail-

able. Today, with defense production gaining momentum, the shoe is on the other foot. Instead of a labor surplus there is the problem of a labor shortage. Under these circumstances, and with veteran's placement facilities maintained as a part of the state employment services, the committee believes that one Federal veteran's representative and a clerk-stenographer for each state and territory would be adequate. Accordingly, the committee has reduced the budget estimate for this service from \$1,583,000 to \$743,500. A small reduction has also been made against the headquarters staff. With only one representative in a state, proportionally more travel will be necessary and allowance has been made for that in arriving at the amount granted. Allowance has also been made for temporary or part-time employment as may be necessary under the set-up recommended.

Grants to States for employment security program.—For this item the committee recommends \$165,560,000, a reduction of \$4,000,000 below the estimate. All of that reduction is against the \$10,000,000 contingency reserve fund. The \$6,000,000 allowed compares with \$8,500,000 appropriated as a contingency fund for 1951 of which approximately \$6,308,000 has been utilized thus far, much of it to meet state salary increases not contemplated in the basic appropriation. The committee believes that \$6,000,000 will be adequate for 1952.

The State employment services are an integral part of the national defense manpower program.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

Salaries and expenses.—The committee has allowed \$100,000 of the requested \$126,000 increase over 1951 to permit the Bureau to add some staff to handle an increased caseload attendant to the increase in the number of employees covered by the Acts it administers.

Employees' compensation fund.—For disability, death compensation, and other payments under the Federal employees' injury compensation law and related acts \$30,000,000 is recommended, a reduction of \$1,000,000 below the estimate of \$31,000,000 but \$2,000,000 above 1951 funds including the \$3,000,000 contained in the supplemental bill recently adopted by the House. Current operations are running at a monthly rate of \$2,500,000. In view of the facts that full impact of the liberalizing 1949 amendments on the fund has been reached and that total federal civilian employment prospectively will be less than contemplated by the budget in 1952, the committee believes that \$30,000,000 will be adequate to cover all liabilities accruing against the fund.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses.—For the regular activities of the bureau, the budget estimate is \$5,935,000, an increase of \$249,300 above the current appropriation. Budget increases were submitted for expanding coverage of wage rate data, collection of additional data on industrial injuries, and additional geographic coverage in the collection of foreign labor data. The committee has imposed a sizeable cut of \$692,000, allowing \$5,243,000; this is \$442,700 less than the current appropriation.

The cut is directed at four activities. The budget breakdown includes \$655,500 for collection and publication of data on housing and public construction. The committee has cut this by \$500,000. This work includes publication of monthly estimates of the volume and quarterly information on the characteristics of new dwelling units started, surveys of selling and rental prices of new dwelling units in several cities, and prices of building materials at the wholesale level. It is a foregone conclusion that as the defense program progresses there is going to be less and less private dwelling construction and non-defense public construction. The essential needs of other federal agencies concerned with housing data in one way or another can be expected to be confined largely to special studies relating to specific problems directly or indirectly arising out of the defense effort. These needs can be met on an individual project or problem basis without necessity of maintaining a huge statistical gathering service on an overall basis at a time when we can least afford it. Budgetwise, such needs can to a large degree be handled on a reimbursable basis as is now done for other special studies.

The budget allotment of \$320,500 for collection of assorted statistics on industrial relations, collective-bargaining agreements, work stoppages, etc., has been reduced by \$120,000. In the committee's opinion some of them do not meet the acid test of essentiality at the present time and the \$200,500 allowed should be adequate.

The budget suggests an increase of \$37,400 to expand coverage of collection of statistics on industrial injuries. The current allotment for that work is \$132,700 and it can get along with that amount in 1952. Officials concerned with accident prevention in industrial establishments know that the highest accident rates obtain in medium- and small-sized establishments. Furthermore, the existing statistical reporting program has shown that the accident rate is rising. The committee does not understand that it is essential to further augment these statistics; enough is already known or being obtained to afford basis for intensified safety programs.

The committee has not allowed the increase of \$35,700 sought for collection of data on foreign labor conditions. The proposal is somewhat nebulous and hazy in regard to exactly how it will contribute effectively to our sum total of knowledge in combatting communistic influences in labor forces.

Revision of Consumers' Price Index.—The committee has included \$1,000,000 as the third and final installment for the cost of the comprehensive revision of the consumers' price index. This is a reduction of \$250,000 below the estimate. The committee believes that the Bureau can wind this project up by the end of fiscal 1952 with the \$1,000,000 recommended by making still further economies. During the past 2 years a total of \$2,972,000 has been expended or allotted for this project; with the \$1,000,000 here recommended, the total cost of \$3,972,000 will be considerably under the original estimate of \$4,326,000 advanced to the committee when the proposition was first presented.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

The budget estimate is \$8,740,000 for this agency to administer the Federal wage-hour law and the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act. The committee has allowed \$8,000,000, a reduction of \$740,000,

and a net decrease of \$344,900 below the current appropriation of \$8,344,900.

The 1949 amendments to the wage-hour law will have been in effect for approximately two years. This should result in some lessening of the work involved in making interpretations and wage determinations under the amendments and some of the reduction is directed to that activity. The principal effect of the committee cut will be to hold the number of inspections to a level somewhat below the 50,000 annual volume contemplated. A substantial increase in appropriation was given this agency last year to expand its activities and it is indicated that approximately 40,000 inspections will be made during the current year, a considerable increase over the level obtaining prior to the amendments. It is believed that during a period of full industrial activity with attendant high employment level such as will obtain in the period ahead the volume of inspections can be held to a lower level than projected and still obtain reasonably adequate enforcement of the law.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

For all items the committee recommends appropriations aggregating \$1,793,226,461, a reduction of \$81,660,799 below budget estimates of \$1,874,887,260. This is a net increase of \$88,006,381 above appropriated funds for 1951 but when the elimination of all contract authorizations provided for 1951, amounting to \$102,750,000, is taken into account, the bill shows a net decrease of \$14,743,619.

In respect to the net increase of \$88,006,381 in appropriated funds it should be pointed out that this includes \$55,500,000 for the emergency school aid program in Federally impacted areas which appears in this bill for the first time. The hospital construction program under the Hill-Burton Act shows an increase of \$65,000,000 because of conversion from contract authorizations to a straight cash basis.

The following condensed table identifies the programs which, dollar-wise, make up the bulk of the total recommended. It will be noted, for example, that 86 percent of the total is accounted for by public assistance grants, emergency school aid, and the hospital construction program. Other items such as operation of marine hospitals, vocational education and vocational rehabilitation grants, child welfare and health grants, and the various public health programs are embraced within the total. Reductions have been made in every instance where the committee felt that could be done without seriously affecting essential programs and activities. The table points up the limitations on the committee in showing larger dollar cuts.

Item	Estimates	Committee bill		Bill compared with—	
		Amount	Percent	1951	Estimates
Public assistance grants.....	\$1,300,000,000	\$1,250,000,000	70	—\$30,000,000	—\$50,000,000
School construction and maintenance in federally-impacted areas.....	103,000,000	103,000,000	6	+55,500,000	-----
Hill-Burton hospital program.....	195,000,000	175,000,000	10	+65,000,000	—20,000,000
Subtotal, above items.....	1,598,000,000	1,528,000,000	86	+90,500,000	—70,000,000
All other items.....	276,887,260	265,226,461	14	—2,493,619	—11,660,799
Total, appropriations.....	1,874,887,260	1,793,226,461	100	+88,006,381	—81,660,799
Contract authorizations (elimination of 1951 authorizations).....	-----	-----	-----	—102,750,000	-----
Total.....	1,874,887,260	1,793,226,461	-----	—14,743,619	—81,660,799

GRANTS FOR SCHOOL AID IN FEDERALLY-IMPACTED AREAS

This bill includes for the first time two new items of appropriation to implement the provisions of Public Laws 815 and 874 of the 81st Congress, approved September 1950. These laws set forth the policy of the Congress in dealing with the problem of school construction and maintenance in areas overburdened by Federal activities. In summary, a total of \$72,500,000 was made available in fiscal year 1951 in the supplemental appropriation act. The budget for 1952 includes a total of \$103,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 is to liquidate contractual obligations incurred under authority granted for construction purposes in 1951. The committee has approved the full amount of the budget estimates for both laws. Each of the two laws and the budgetary provisions for them are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Maintenance and operation grants.—The sum of \$23,000,000 was appropriated for this purpose under Public Law 874 for fiscal year 1951. Appropriations of other federal agencies heretofore having had some responsibility for school assistance are estimated to have included approximately \$5,103,000, making a total available for these payments of approximately \$28,103,000. The estimate for 1952, which the committee has adopted, is \$28,000,000. The committee examined carefully into the financial aspects of the experience under the law to date in an effort to establish a firm base for determining financial requirements for the coming year. The best information available indicates that, in view of the constant expansion of the defense program, the \$28,000,000 will be needed in 1952. Entitlements to assistance are determined in accord with the eligibility requirements set out in the law and whatever obligations are determined under its provisions have to be met within limits of available funds. Public Law 874 expires at the end of fiscal year 1954.

Construction grants.—The budget request for grants is \$75,000,000. However, \$25,000,000 is to liquidate grant obligations incurred in 1951 under contract authority. Omitting the \$3,000,000 appropriated in 1951 for a national survey of school construction needs, \$46,500,000 was made available for construction in 1951, so that in terms of funds for *additional* construction grants, there is an increase of \$3,500,000 recommended. The committee feels that it has little choice but to recommend approval of the full budget estimate in view of the facts developed as to needs.

As more experience is gained in actual operations, as full impact of the defense program on affected school systems becomes known in the months ahead, plus the possibility of some rise in construction costs, it seems safe to state that the total cost will probably exceed the preliminary estimate of \$380,000,000 assuming all entitlements under the law are paid. On the basis of firm information as to present requirements for educational facilities on federal military reservations and in such special areas as the Savannah River project, plus applications already received from local school systems, it appears clear that even under the most rigid priority screening of applications the present appropriation is insufficient to meet the need and that the additional \$50,000,000 recommended for 1952 will fill only part of the gap. The matter of allocation of materials for school construction in relation to other essential needs is also in the picture. These and other imponder-

ables render it impossible at this stage to determine precisely what the full requirements will be. Under the law, all construction applications must be submitted to the Office of Education by June 30, 1952.

The committee has included two language provisions suggested in the budget dealing with priority of approval of applications within available funds. These provisions supplement existing priority procedures set out in the law and appear to be necessary in the interest of putting first things first.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

The committee recommends \$20,475,000 for payments to states to continue the program of assisting in rehabilitation of handicapped civilians. The \$2,525,000 requested to expand the beneficiary rolls has been disallowed in view of the urgent need for holding down federal expenditures. The reduction of \$125,000 below the current appropriation is accounted for by budget decreases, accepted by the committee, in the allotments for guidance and placement work and administrative expenses of the state agencies.

The Committee has not accepted the budget language seeking to place a limitation on expenditures for guidance and placement. This is a category of expense wholly within control of the federal agency. The entire cost is borne by the federal appropriation. The committee is not aware of any useful purpose to be served by the language that cannot be assured through the administrative power of allotment making. It is a responsibility of the Federal agency to see that within the overall total, proper balance is maintained as between guidance and placement work and the purchase of case services on the basis set out in the budget submission.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Venereal diseases.—The committee has reduced the venereal disease item \$100,000, allowing \$11,700,000. This is \$1,163,500 below currently available funds. Progressive reductions have been made in this appropriation in each of the past several years. The \$100,000 cut applies to the several activities, as follows: Grants to States, \$45,000; technical assistance to States, \$45,000; research, \$4,000; and general administration, \$6,000.

It is important that this program be adequately supported if the gains in reducing incidence of venereal diseases in recent years are to be held. The size of the problem increases during emergency periods involving shifts in concentrations of population, activation of military installations, etc. With the very effective treatment procedures available, the most important activity is case finding and treatment. State and local health departments are shifting emphasis by making larger allotments for special out-patient treatment and case finding activities in areas requiring priority attention. In view of importance of the matter as a public health problem, the committee has not made a larger reduction.

Tuberculosis.—For this cooperative federal-state control program, the committee recommends \$8,745,000, a reduction of \$255,000 below the estimate of \$9,000,000, and \$655,000 below 1951 funds. Of the \$255,000 cut, \$200,000 is against state grants and \$55,000 is against the allotment for Public Health Service technical assistance.

The committee reduction has been made as a necessary contribution to the urgent need for reducing federal outlays. The \$200,000 cut, which comes on top of a similar reduction in the current year, averages out to about \$4,000 per state and should not seriously affect this important program.

Progress is being made in bringing tuberculosis under control, but sustained support is essential if further progress is to be made and gains are not to be lost. The national death rate and total number of deaths from tuberculosis have dropped substantially in the past 10 years; nevertheless, approximately 40,000 people died in 1949 from tuberculosis.

The committee inquired into the matter of utilization of X-ray units. The state health departments operate the mobile units in smaller cities and the Public Health Service limits its direct operations to the larger cities. There have been some indications that in certain instances maximum publicity work has not been done in advance of arrival of the mobile unit in the community, with result that the fullest possible coverage in the shortest possible time and thus the lowest per capita cost is not obtained. The committee believes the Public Health Service should be ever alert to this since effective advance publicity and planning is basic to maximum success of the operation.

Assistance to States, general.—For this general health item, the budget recommends \$16,084,000 which is identical with the current appropriation. The committee recommends \$15,960,000, a general reduction of \$124,000, applied as follows: State grants, \$40,500; Public Health technical assistance, \$55,000; vital statistics work, \$23,000; and general administration, \$5,500.

The basic purpose of these funds is to assist the states in supporting local public health services and basic health services at the state level. In times of emergency or disasters of major proportions involving medical and health problems the local public health organization would be indispensable to immediate action and as a framework around which emergency services could be built. In the Committee's opinion this is an added justification for recommending continued support of these services.

Communicable diseases.—The budget estimate for this item is \$6,150,000, including a \$100,000 supplemental submitted in House Document 66, against which the committee recommends \$6,090,000, a cut of \$60,000 composed of \$50,000 against the overall allocation for specific disease prevention and control and \$10,000 against general administration. The total allowed represents a net reduction of \$170,600 below currently available funds due to further curtailment of participation in the malaria and typhus-control programs, offset in part by relatively minor increases for direct research work which have been approved as submitted.

This program provides for laboratory and field investigations, control operations, and training facilities to supplement and support activities of state and local health departments in the control of a host of communicable diseases. These activities are essential as normal peacetime measures. Some of them also provide the foundation for special operations which would be necessary in case of a national emergency such as, for example, biological warfare. The communicable disease center is now conducting research in this general area

although it is seriously handicapped by lack of laboratory facilities for this specialized kind of work. Inquiry was made as to steps being taken to provide suitable physical facilities to permit this important work to go forward. Funds have heretofore been appropriated for plans and specifications and the committee is informed that the General Services Administration is now preparing those plans. The committee believes that this is an important piece of work and suggests that the urgency of the times requires that this project be given high priority of attention by appropriate officials of the Government.

Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene.—For this item the committee recommends \$3,710,000 which is \$90,000 below the estimate of \$3,800,000, but a net increase of \$39,970 above 1951 funds to permit continuation of all activities at approximately the current level and specifically to allow for the requested expansion of radiological health service research. The reduction includes \$62,000 against the allotment for water pollution control work and relatively small decreases against the several other activities financed under this head.

Grants, water pollution control.—Against the budget estimate of \$1,000,000 for this item, a general cut of \$100,000 has been levied, allowing \$900,000. These funds are granted to the states and interstate agencies to assist in investigations and research related to prevention and control of water pollution caused by industrial wastes. This is a joint undertaking with the Federal Government. The committee believes that this reduction can be absorbed without any serious effect. According to the table of allotments in the printed hearings, the largest single cut for any state on a flat 10 percent basis would be \$3,480.

Hospital construction program.—The budget estimate for hospital construction grants under the Hill-Burton law aggregates \$195,000,000, of which \$120,000,000 is liquidation cash for obligations previously incurred under contract authority and \$75,000,000 is for additional projects. The committee recommends \$100,000,000 for liquidation cash, a reduction of \$20,000,000, and the budget figure of \$75,000,000 cash for additional allotments, the latter amount being \$10,000,000 below the amount available for that purpose in the current fiscal year.

In considering what recommendation to make regarding additional allotments, the committee has taken into account a number of factors. First, the need for additional hospital facilities throughout the country. The survey conducted under the original law established that need at about 900,000 additional beds. Projects approved under the program to date will add about 73,000 beds. Many more would be added under projects planned but not yet approved for lack of funds. In this connection, the committee is advised that 453 projects were deferred when the cutback was made last fall, and that 88 of those, involving about \$33,000,000, had reached the point where land had been acquired, local funds raised, architects hired and plans prepared; a list of the projects appears on page 654 of the printed hearings. Secondly, in an emergency such as we would possibly have in the event of war we would need far more hospital facilities than we now have. On the other hand, there are several limiting factors pertaining to the level of Federal support, the most important of which is Federal dollars. Moreover, some difficulties have been encountered in obtaining construction materials and that situation will probably become more acute. There is also the limited availability of trained hospital personnel.

As regards liquidation cash, \$195,000,000 has heretofore been appropriated, most of which will have been expended by June 30, 1951. The expenditure rate during recent months has been about \$13,000,000. With the program now at half the level of a year ago and the effect which materials difficulties will have on the over-all rate of construction generally, the committee believes that \$100,000,000 will provide all the funds needed to meet accruing Federal payments.

Hospitals and medical care.—The committee has approved the full budget estimate of \$30,200,000 for this item which embraces funds for operation of 24 hospitals and over 120 outpatient facilities for medical care to American seamen, the Coast Guard, employee compensation cases, persons afflicted with Hansen's disease, and drug addicts. Legal beneficiaries of other Federal agencies, such as veterans, are also cared for on a reimbursable basis. The amount allowed is \$1,176,000 above the current appropriation of \$29,024,000.

The committee has been importuned from a number of sources to provide adequate funds for operation of facilities providing medical care for American seamen. It is believed that within the amount approved reasonably adequate service can be provided for the several groups of beneficiaries. All mandatory cost increases have been allowed as well as some increase for a general price rise for subsistence and medical supplies. Provision has also been made for expanding Coast Guard medical services attendant upon the general increase in its activities. For all categories of patients, the budget reflects a slight drop in estimated daily patient load.

With respect to the Fort Worth neuropsychiatric hospital there is a significant change in the composition of the patient load, involving a planned withdrawal of about 300 veterans cases and a like increase of drug addict cases. Drug addiction is becoming an increasingly serious problem, particularly among teen-agers, as evidenced by the attention this problem is receiving in the public press. The Fort Worth and Lexington hospitals are two of the principal institutions in the country furnishing treatment for drug addicts. A significant portion of the total increase approved is for admission of a larger number of addicts at the Fort Worth institution.

National Institutes of Health.—For all purposes and activities embraced by this item, the budget estimate is \$15,800,000. The committee recommends \$15,500,000, a reduction of \$300,000. All manner of basic medical research is financed under this appropriation. The committee cut is applicable to the general category of research and training grants.

The principal purpose of the increase allowed over 1951 is to implement the provisions of Public Law 692, approved in August 1950, which established the two institutes for research on arthritis, rheumatism, and metabolic diseases, and on neurological diseases and blindness. No funds have heretofore been specifically made available under that law although some research has been done in these general fields within limitations of the funds available for the regular research program of the Institutes. In comparison with the size of the problems which these institutes were set up to deal with, the amounts included in the bill are comparatively small. For example, it has been estimated that about 7,000,000 people are suffering from some type of arthritis or other form of rheumatic disease. Several hundred thousand are affected by eye diseases and blindness to one degree or

another. Much more research is urgently needed to determine some of the answers with respect to cerebral palsy and multiple sclerosis. The facts in connection with these health problems—and the committee has had the benefit of testimony of people expert in these fields—are persuasive justification for support of this research.

National Cancer Institute.—The sum of \$19,500,000 is recommended for all purposes under the Institute program, which is \$447,000 less than the budget estimate of \$19,947,000 and a net reduction of \$386,000 below the current appropriation. Making up the \$447,000 cut are the following: \$200,000 against the liquidation cash figure, the committee being advised that this amount will not be needed; \$100,000 against research and training grants; \$100,000 against grants to States for control services; \$37,000 against direct research; and \$10,000 against general administration. In the aggregate, the program can be maintained with the amount recommended at least at the current level. For some years the committee has been very much interested in adequate and sustained support of this important program but has felt it necessary to make some savings in the expenditure proposals presented.

This program must be reasonably well supported if the ultimate objective of finding the causes and cure for all forms of cancer is to be achieved. No one can fail to be sympathetic to that objective. Cancer is the number two killer of people. More than 200,000 died of cancer in the United States in 1950. Authorities agree that the key to ultimate success lies in further research.

Mental health activities.—For this item the committee recommends \$10,300,000. This is \$500,000 below the budget estimate, as follows: \$250,000 against the liquidation cash item on the basis of information that this much will not be needed; \$200,000 against the general category of research and training grants; \$44,000 against direct research; and \$6,000 against general administration. Some increase has been allowed over 1951, however, as a general strengthening measure in view of the size and complexity of the mental health problem.

Some idea of the problem can be had by reference to available statistics. It has been estimated that there are approximately 8,500,000 people in the United States suffering from some form of mental illness. Over 50 percent of all hospital beds are occupied by mental patients. Hundreds of millions of dollars are expended annually by the Government and the states for support of mental institutions. In relation to the size of the problem, relatively small amounts are being expended for research into the causes, methods of treatment, training, and other aspects of the total effort to cope with the situation. As in the case of the heart and cancer programs, the committee believes that this program urgently deserves reasonable support on a continuing basis.

National Heart Institute.—The sum of \$10,000,000 is recommended for this item, a reduction of \$150,000 below the estimate and a net decrease of \$4,554,400 below current funds. The principal items of decrease below 1951 are \$4,459,000 liquidation cash for construction grants and \$200,000 further reduction in grants to states for control activities. The committee's reduction consists of \$91,000 against research and training grants and \$59,000 against direct research. These committee reductions are without prejudice to the merits of the items but it was felt necessary to show some retrenchment

in light of the critical fiscal situation. Under the committee's recommendation, approximately \$80,000 additional will be available in 1952 for all types of research and training grants; direct research and other operations of the institute will continue at the existing level.

Diseases of the heart and circulatory system for many years have headed the national list of causes of death; over 700,000 people die in this country each year from those diseases. It has been estimated that at least 9,000,000 people are suffering from some form of heart or circulatory condition. These are persuasive statistics in support of adequate financing of research and other activities in this field.

Dental health activities.—The budget of \$1,750,000 for this item is \$204,850 below 1951 funds. The committee has imposed a further reduction of \$250,000, allowing \$1,500,000 for 1952. The committee's cut of \$250,000 is directed to the item of \$460,000 set up to continue, on a reduced basis, operation of mobile units demonstrating the application of sodium fluoride to the teeth of children. During the current year approximately 30 demonstration teams are in operation and the budget contemplates operation of 20 teams next year; in 1950, 39 teams operated in some 40 states and territories. This program was initiated by the committee three years ago as a practical and effective means of getting quick field application of a simple and valuable research finding that sodium fluoride applied to the teeth of children under a prescribed schedule would materially reduce dental caries. The committee is advised that to date some 450 communities have established continuing topical fluoride application programs following these demonstrations. From all indications the program has been highly effective and beneficial and demonstrations in additional communities would be desirable. However, in view of the paramount need for retrenchment the committee feels that some further reduction can be made in this activity. Sufficient funds have been left in the bill to operate about 10 units in additional communities.

Construction of research facilities.—The bill includes \$17,690,000 for continuation of construction of the clinical research center at Bethesda, Maryland and for initial equipment, supplies, and apparatus. The center is expected to be opened for operation late in calendar year 1952 or early 1953. Of the total, \$10,650,000 is liquidation cash for prior contract authority.

The reduction of \$900,000 below the estimate is in two parts. One item of \$800,000 pertains to liquidation cash requested in connection with construction of auxiliary service area structures. In past years \$800,000 was made available for purchase of an electro-static generator. Because of certain changes in technical developments those funds have not yet been obligated; they are being held in budget reserve. The committee is advised that it appears unlikely that contracts for that equipment will be placed in time for delivery in fiscal year 1952 and thus cash requirements for 1952 will be \$800,000 less than projected. The other \$100,000 has been applied against the request for supplies, furnishings, and equipment. Exercise of prudent and economical planning for furnishings in offices and quarters should make it possible to take care of all essential needs within the reduced allowance.

ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses.—The bill includes the budget estimate for direct appropriation of \$2,135,000 for partial support of this institution, an increase of \$130,000 above the current figure of \$2,005,000. Approximately 80 percent of the operating budget comes from reimbursements for care of patients for which other agencies are financially responsible, principally the District of Columbia. The principal items of increase are within-grade salary advancements, increased cost of food and other supplies, and the addition of personnel to staff a new treatment building for aged people which will be ready for occupancy about July 1.

Major repairs and construction.—The bill includes the budget item of \$136,500 for various repair jobs to the old buildings and facilities of the institution.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

BUREAU OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

The Committee has made a \$25,000 reduction against the direct appropriation request for this Bureau, allowing \$175,000. Operating funds are derived from two sources, namely, direct appropriation from the Treasury and fees collected from credit unions for chartering, supervision, and examination services. Fee receipts are projected at \$598,000 which together with the \$175,000 appropriation would make \$773,000 available, as compared with approximately \$755,000 in the current year. Allowing for dropping of nonrecurring items, an actual working fund increase of approximately \$29,000 is in sight to meet necessary cost increases.

The committee is pleased to note that the agency has increased the examination fee assessed against credit unions as one step in making this operation more nearly self-supporting. The committee has been insisting that ultimately the entire cost of the bureau should be derived from assessments against the some 5,000 Federally-chartered credit unions and has urged that legislation be submitted to change those provisions of the law which presently stand in the way of further increasing revenues appreciably. The committee is advised that legislation has been submitted and wishes to urge the appropriate legislative committee to consider the matter with view to recommending such changes as may be found appropriate.

BUREAU OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

For administrative expenses of the bureau in administering the social security retirement system, the committee has allowed \$58,000,000, a reduction of \$2,000,000 below the request but \$1,012,000 net above 1951 funds, primarily to meet mandatory items and additional costs attributable to the 1950 amendments. All expenses of administering the program are charged to the trust fund.

The committee is impressed with the competence of the leadership of this Bureau and believes that the Bureau will be able to do a satisfactory job within the amount allowed.

BUREAU OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Grants to States.—The bill includes \$1,250,000,000, a reduction of \$50,000,000 below the estimate and \$30,000,000 below the current appropriation, for grants to states to match expenditures for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind under titles I, IV, and X, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled under the new title XIV of the social security act. Authority to obligate the Government for these expenditures is in the formula of the basic statute. Once a matchable expenditure has been made by the state the making of the Federal appropriation and the matching payment is mandatory.

The budget increase of \$20,000,000 represented the net result of several factors. Those serving to increase expenditures arise principally from the fact that the 1950 amendments will be in effect for a full year in 1952 as against only 9 months of the current year. On the other hand, the liberalizing amendments to the old-age and survivors insurance provisions made it possible to drop some needy aged from the public assistance rolls and to reduce payments to others. The general manpower shortage attendant upon the defense program will mean that some people who otherwise would be applying for public assistance or aid for dependent children will be in the labor force and thus disqualify themselves for public assistance payments.

The new program for aid to the permanently and totally disabled has not developed in as many states as rapidly as had been estimated. Some \$14,500,000 of current funds have already been impounded as not being required and it may very well be that additional amounts will remain unused. It is apparent that the budget as submitted, judged from the way things look now, may have been too optimistic as to the rate of approval of state plans under this new provision. The committee is also of the opinion that sufficient allowance has not been made for the decline in expenditures for old-age assistance and aid to dependent children resulting from people, otherwise eligible for assistance, remaining in the labor force. The committee is therefore recommending a \$50,000,000 reduction to bring the total in line with what now appears will be adequate under the several programs.

Salaries and expenses.—A general reduction of \$98,000 has been made in the budget estimate for expenses of this bureau, allowing \$1,600,000, which is sufficiently above current funds to take care of within grade salary advancements, projection of positions approved for a portion of the current year to a full year basis, and additional expenses to handle increased work arising out of the 1950 amendments.

CHILDREN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses.—The estimate for this item is \$1,592,000, against which the committee recommends \$1,450,000. The committee is not convinced that the bureau needs the additional personnel sought and, furthermore, that some retrenchment below the current appropriation can be made without sacrificing any essential activity. A very substantial part of the reduction is directed at personnel costs.

Grants.—The estimate for grants to states is \$33,000,000, an increase of \$2,750,000 over the 1951 appropriation which in turn represented a substantial increase of \$8,250,000 above the \$22,000,000 appropria-

tion level of the preceding several years. The committee recommends \$30,000,000 for 1952. Under the terms of the law a portion of these funds is subject to matching by the states. Balances of matching funds not utilized at the end of the first year carry over for use the following year and are budgeted for expenditure before additional allotments are made. The record shows that there has been an average carryover since 1947 of over \$3,000,000 annually. Thus in 1951 the states have available a total of \$33,328,700 although the appropriation for 1951 was only \$30,250,000. The committee is not aware of any useful purpose served by these carry-overs and has therefore eliminated \$3,000,000 from the 1952 request.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries.—The overall budget for this item is \$2,832,000, a proposed increase of \$108,300 above 1951 funds of \$2,723,700. The committee recommends a total of \$2,682,000, a reduction of \$150,000. Funds are derived from direct appropriation and transfer from the OASI trust fund. Activities embraced include general executive direction, program coordination, field services including management and house-keeping costs in agency regional offices, publications and reports, and administrative services at the agency level.

The two additional positions requested for the program coordination and development group have not been allowed. For the past two years the committee has denied increases for this on the basis that it saw no justification for enlarging the staff and there is essentially nothing new in the picture at this point. The cut is also directed at the items for general administration and direction, publications and reports, the merit system staff, and administrative services. These groups can stand a cut without impairing essential staff and services at these levels provided the most effective use is made of the staff and all nonessentials are dispensed with. Furthermore, the makeup of the budget as between the several Washington activities does not appear completely realistic. As an example the committee understands that at this level a number of units have been formed under an Assistant Administrator for Defense Activities. The agency took it upon itself to create these units at the top level. The Federal Security Agency is not a defense agency. It does have some defense related activities assigned to it but the actual work is done in the subject matter bureaus. Any necessary coordination and supervision from the top level in the agency on these activities would be minimal. During World War II certain bureaus of the agency handled war related programs such as training that were more extensive than anything now existing and the staff at the agency level was less than it is today for comparable activities. Why an Assistant Administrator for Defense Activities with a number of defense-titled units appended to him is needed in an agency like Federal Security is not apparent to the committee.

Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations.—For salaries and expenses of this division which embraces certain agency-wide central services and miscellaneous expenses for the Office of the Administrator, the budget request is for a total of \$915,000, and the committee has approved \$835,000, a reduction of \$80,000. The committee is of the opinion that with critical review of the numerous

budget allocations under this appropriation after application of the cut against the salary appropriation for the Office of the Administrator, no essential activity will suffer from this reduction.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The estimate for the Board is \$8,582,500. The committee has allowed \$8,300,000, a reduction of \$282,500. The current appropriation is \$8,562,500 and the amount allowed for 1952 is below this by \$262,500. However, transfer of space rental costs to General Services Administration in 1952 will relieve the Board's appropriation of a \$353,000 charge which will offset the aforementioned reduction of \$262,500 and provide \$90,500 additional to meet various cost increases including projection to a full year basis of several positions filled for only part of the current year. The estimate as presented to the committee also included provision for 21 additional positions at an annual cost of \$125,000 but the committee has not seen fit to allow for them.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

For all items under this heading, including the National Railroad Adjustment Board, the committee recommends \$1,150,000, a reduction of \$48,000 below total estimates of \$1,198,000 and \$348,500 below current funds. For expenses of the National Mediation Board, the \$410,000 request has been rounded off to an even \$400,000. The budget of \$150,000 for arbitration and emergency boards has been adopted.

A general reduction of \$38,000 has been made against the appropriation for the Adjustment Board. The minimum amount earmarked in the budget language for employment of referees in deadlocked cases has been reduced by \$28,000 but the committee leaves to final determination of the Board whether that much of the \$38,000 cut should be applied to that particular item of expense. The Adjustment Board allowance is \$164,300 below its current appropriation but \$129,400 of that is represented by elimination of office rental costs to be assumed by General Services Administration.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

The budget for 1952 proposes to revise the method of making appropriations to the railroad retirement trust fund. It is proposed to abandon the annual definite basis and henceforth appropriate on an indefinite basis. Essentially the proposition is to appropriate retirement taxes to the trust fund monthly as they are collected during the year in lieu of the present practice of estimating tax collections in advance and making a definite amount available to the board at the beginning of the year based thereon. The committee has had this matter under study for the past two years and has decided to recommend approval of the budget as presented. This decision rests primarily on two premises. First, the change will result in an annual saving to the Treasury of approximately \$4,500,000 which under the present appropriation procedure is the interest cost to the Treasury on advances to the trust fund before the collection of equivalent taxes under the retirement tax act. Secondly, it would remove from the

budget making and appropriation procedures the guesswork inherent in any system which seeks to estimate and appropriate a definite amount in advance of actual collection of taxes which the advance amount is supposed to represent. In addition, it should be pointed out that the procedure proposed is basically the same as that followed in the social security retirement operation.

The second point is well illustrated by what happened in the appropriation bill last year and by reference to the comparative figures for this year. The 1951 bill reflected a "reduction" of \$136,000,000 as compared with the preceding year because the 1950 definite appropriation figure had been made on the basis of an advance *estimate* of tax collections which, however, failed to materialize by \$136,000,000. It will be noted elsewhere in this report that the budget and the accompanying bill reflect an increase, appropriation-wise, of \$174,995,076 over the 1951 appropriation whereas, in fact, retirement tax collections in 1952 are estimated to be only \$48,000,000 above the estimate of collections during 1951. Under present procedure it is necessary in arriving at the annual appropriation figure to indulge in a series of put-and-take adjustments to take account of this inability to estimate accurately in advance. The bill totals are inflated in terms of appropriations constituting true charges against general revenues and comparisons with the budget and prior year appropriations are materially distorted, all of which makes for confusion and difficulty in presenting the bill. The indefinite form of appropriation recommended will completely cure this situation in addition to having the important virtue of saving the Treasury \$4,500,000 at a time when every dollar counts.

It has been suggested that it was the intent of the 1937 railroad retirement act that the "annual premium" authorized therein be appropriated to the trust fund in advance of collection of retirement taxes by the treasury. The committee is not aware of anything in the law or its legislative history to give substance to this contention. It is through the advance appropriation procedure that the board is in position, in effect, to invest at the outset of the fiscal year a substantial portion of the retirement taxes before they are collected. This results in unjust enrichment of the trust fund at the expense of the general taxpayer because the treasury pays interest on funds advanced before those advances are covered by tax collections. The history of the Railroad Retirement legislation indicates that the system was intended to be "self-supporting". The original 1934 act, in fact, contained both the tax and benefit provisions for the system. Because of constitutional objections, however, it was necessary to separate the taxing provisions from the benefit provisions and today there are two acts, one dealing with retirement taxes and the other dealing with benefits.

The law provides also for periodic actuarial valuations on the basis of which any necessary changes in tax rates are recommended to produce amounts for the actuarial reserve which together with interest earnings will be sufficient to maintain the minimum actuarial requirements of the system. Another evidence of intent that the system be completely self-supporting is to be found in a statement taken from the 1938 annual report of the retirement board, which is:

While the Carrier's Taxing Act is administered by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the legislative history of the Retirement Act indicates an intention to appropriate for the Retirement account and for expenses of administration amounts equal to the collections under the Taxing Act.

It appears clear to the committee that as long as all retirement taxes collected are appropriated to the trust fund the requirement in the 1937 act authorizing appropriation of an "annual premium" is being fulfilled. As a matter of fact, not even under the present "advance" appropriation method does the board come into possession of the entire appropriation for investment purposes at the outset of the year. The amount estimated to be required for benefit payments and administrative expenses during the last three quarters of the fiscal year is withheld and advanced to the board in installments at the beginning of each of those quarters.

Board officials have inferred to the committee that withdrawal of the interest subsidy of \$4,500,000 would adversely affect the soundness of the fund. The committee has considered that aspect of the matter very carefully, and is unable to reconcile this view with the repeated statements that the system was to be financed from taxes collected and thus be self-supporting. If an interest subsidy from the Treasury is needed to aid in financing the system, then one statement does not comport with the other and the system is not truly self-supporting.

The Treasury Department plans to inaugurate a new system of tax collection effective with fiscal year 1952. Taxes will hereafter be collected monthly instead of quarterly to get funds into the board's hands as quickly as possible for investment purposes in order to assure that actuarial interest earning requirements can be met.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Total appropriations of \$3,097,000 are recommended for this service, a reduction of \$200,000 below the estimates but a net increase of \$97,300 above current appropriations. The principal budget increase would have provided for addition of 50 field conciliators to handle an expected larger volume of labor-management disputes predicated upon expanded industrial activity. The committee has not seen fit to approve the expansion to the extent proposed but has allowed for some portion of it. Taking into account elimination of space rental costs being assumed by General Services Administration and several minor cost adjustments, the allowance includes approximately \$119,000 for employment of additional conciliators.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in the bill are recommended:

On page 14, beginning in line 3, in connection with the appropriation for vocational education grants:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

On page 15, beginning in line 17, and continuing on page 16 through line 3, in connection with emergency school construction grants:

Provided, That no portion of this appropriation shall be available for reimbursement payments under section 205 (c) (1) of such Act with respect to school facilities completed before July 1, 1951: Provided further, That in determining relative urgency of need for purposes of prescribing, under section 206 (d) of such Act, the order in which

certifications for payments from this appropriation shall be made (other than payments in liquidation of contractual obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1951), the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the extent to which the school facilities are needed in the interests of national defense.

On pages 35 and 36, beginning in line 14 on page 35, under the Railroad Retirement Board (substance of new matter is indicated in *italics*):

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said Acts as may be specifically authorized annually in appropriation Acts, there is hereby appropriated *for crediting monthly to the railroad retirement account for the fiscal year 1952, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to the amount covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during each such fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (26 U. S. C. 1500-1538): Provided, That the appropriation made herein for the fiscal year 1952 shall be adjusted by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, in such manner as may be necessary to insure that the railroad retirement account shall be credited for an amount equal to the amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) prior to July 1, 1951, under said Railroad Retirement Tax Act and under the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended, less (1) amounts credited as premiums to the railroad retirement account (excluding \$334,429,100 heretofore appropriated for military service credits) and (2) amounts properly chargeable as administrative expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board, prior to July 1, 1951.*

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1951	Estimates, 1952	Increase (+), decrease (-)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Office of the Secretary: Replacement of personal property sold.....	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	-----
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY			
American Printing House for the Blind (act of June 25, 1906)	10, 000	10, 000	-----
Office of Education:			-----
Payments to States and Territories for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts (act of Mar. 4, 1907)	2, 550, 000	2, 550, 000	-----
Payment to States for promotion of vocational education (Act of Feb. 23, 1947)	7, 150, 123	7, 150, 123	-----
Total, Office of Education	9, 700, 123	9, 700, 123	-----
Public Health Service: Operation of commissaries, hospitals, at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex. (act of Dec. 23, 1943)	186, 000	187, 500	+\$1, 500
Office of the Administrator: Replacement of personal property sold ..	57, 950	51, 375	--6, 575
Total permanent appropriations, Federal Security Agency ..	9, 954, 073	9, 948, 998	--5, 075
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD ¹			
Railroad unemployment insurance administration fund	9, 800, 000	10, 000, 000	+200, 000
Total permanent appropriations, all agencies	19, 756, 573	19, 951, 498	+194, 925

¹ Table does not list \$33,000,000 appropriated in 1950 act for payment, however, in 1951 and 1952 to the railroad retirement account.

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against general revenue]

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1951 ¹	Estimates, 1952	Increase (+), decrease (-)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Bureau of Employees Compensation:			
Relief and Rehabilitation, Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act, as amended-----	\$40, 000	\$40, 000	-----
Relief and Rehabilitation, Workman's Compensation Act, within the District of Columbia-----	10, 000	10, 000	-----
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special statistical work-----	15, 350	-----	-\$15, 350
Total, Department of Labor-----	65, 350	50, 000	-15, 350
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY			
American Printing House for the Blind: To promote the education of the blind, interest-----	10, 000	10, 000	-----
Public Health Service:			
Patients, benefit funds, Public Health Service Hospitals-----	1, 500	1, 500	-----
Public Health Service conditional gift funds-----	19, 000	19, 000	-----
Public Health Service unconditional gift funds-----	4, 720	27, 120	+22, 400
Office of Administrator: Miscellaneous trust funds, Federal Security Agency-----	679, 069	422, 000	-257, 069
Total, Federal Security Agency-----	714, 289	479, 620	-234, 669
Total trust funds, all agencies-----	779, 639	529, 620	-250, 019

¹ Several of the amounts are tentative estimates of amounts to be appropriated in 1951, and are therefore subject to change.

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Agency and item	Approved, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY						
Office of Education: Grants for emergency school construction-----	\$25, 000, 000	\$25, 000, 000			—\$25, 000, 000	-----
Public Health Service:						
Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati laboratory-----	2, 400, 000	2, 400, 000			—2, 400, 000	-----
Hospital construction-----	150, 000, 000	75, 000, 000			—75, 000, 000	-----
Construction of research facilities, Bethesda, Md-----	350, 000	350, 000			—350, 000	-----
Saint Elizabeths Hospital: Construction and equipment, 2 treatment buildings-----	3, 938, 000					-----
Total, contract authorizations-----	181, 688, 000	102, 750, 000			—102, 750, 000	-----

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951, AMOUNTS AS REDUCED UNDER SECTION 1214
(GENERAL REDUCTION OF \$550,000,000 IN GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951), ESTIMATES FOR 1952
AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1952

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

[Figures in brackets not added in totals]

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with--	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY						
Salaries and expenses-----	\$1, 425, 823	\$1, 425, 823	\$1, 475, 000	\$1, 425, 000	—\$823	—\$50, 000
Solicitor's office, salaries and expenses-----	2, 018, 160	1, 721, 160	1, 750, 000	1, 650, 000	—71, 160	—100, 000
Labor Standards, Bureau of, salaries and expenses-----	786, 000	766, 000	766, 000	688, 000	—78, 000	—78, 000
Veterans' Reemployment Rights Bureau, salaries and expenses-----	281, 000	281, 000	277, 000	277, 000	—4, 000	-----
Total, Office of the Secretary-----	4, 510, 983	4, 193, 983	4, 268, 000	4, 040, 000	—153, 983	—228, 000
BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP						
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 788, 000	2, 776, 000	2, 692, 000	2, 692, 000	—84, 000	-----
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY						
Salaries and expenses-----	5, 531, 000	5, 531, 000	5, 475, 000	4, 635, 500	—895, 500	—839, 500

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in general appropriation act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY—con.						
Grants to States:						
Basic appropriation-----	\$170,000,000	\$163,639,000	\$159,560,000	\$159,560,000	—\$4,079,000	-----
Contingency reserve-----	8,500,000	8,500,000	10,000,000	6,000,000	—2,500,000	—\$4,000,000
Subtotal, grants-----	178,500,000	172,139,000	169,560,000	165,560,000	—6,579,000	—4,000,000
Total, Bureau of Employment Security-----	184,031,000	177,670,000	175,035,000	170,195,500	—7,474,500	—4,839,500
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION						
Salaries and expenses:						
Appropriation-----	1,853,777	1,846,777	1,973,000	1,947,000	+100,223	—26,000
War claims transfer-----	[119,000]	[119,000]	[122,000]	[122,000]	[+3,000]	-----
Employees' compensation fund:						
Appropriation-----	128,000,000	128,000,000	31,000,000	30,000,000	+2,000,000	—1,000,000
War claims transfer-----	[5,000,000]	[5,000,000]	[5,000,000]	[5,000,000]	-----	-----
Total, Bureau of Employees' Compensation-----	129,853,777	129,846,777	32,973,000	31,947,000	+2,100,223	—1,026,000

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS					
Salaries and expenses-----	5, 720, 700	5, 685, 700	5, 935, 000	5, 243, 000	-442, 700
Revision of consumers' price index-----	2, 000, 000	2, 000, 000	1, 250, 000	1, 000, 000	-1, 000, 000
Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics-----	7, 720, 700	7, 685, 700	7, 185, 000	6, 243, 000	-942, 000
WOMEN'S BUREAU					
Salaries and expenses-----	399, 000	389, 000	396, 000	389, 000	-7, 000
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION					
Salaries and expenses-----	9, 344, 900	8, 344, 900	8, 740, 000	8, 000, 000	-740, 000
Total, Department of Labor-----	2238, 648, 360	230, 906, 360	231, 289, 000	223, 506, 500	-7, 782, 500

¹ Includes \$3,000,000 pending supplemental.

² For comparability with the 1952 estimates, this includes a total of \$27,075,260 appropriated under various items in Federal Security Agency in 1951, all relating to the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, which was transferred to Labor by Reorganization Plan No. 19 of 1950, and which is included in the 1952 estimates under Labor.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in general appropriation act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND						
Grant funds (education of the blind)-----	\$115, 000	\$115, 000	\$115, 000	\$115, 000	-----	-----
COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF						
Salaries and expenses-----	368, 200	368, 200	390, 000	390, 000	+\$21, 800	-----
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION						
Salaries and expenses (general)-----	5, 466, 700	5, 266, 700	5, 395, 000	5, 345, 000	+78, 300	—\$50, 000
Certification and inspection services, salaries and expenses (special)-----	¹ [1, 049, 300]	¹ [1, 049, 300]	¹ [1, 049, 300]	¹ [1, 049, 300]	-----	-----
Total, Food and Drug Administration-----	5, 466, 700	5, 266, 700	5, 395, 000	5, 345, 000	+78, 300	—50, 000
FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL						
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 600, 000	2, 595, 000	2, 987, 000	2, 906, 500	+311, 500	—80, 500
HOWARD UNIVERSITY						
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 500, 000	2, 500, 000	2, 575, 000	2, 525, 000	+25, 000	—50, 000

Plans and specifications-----	100, 000	100, 000	55, 500	55, 500	-44, 500	-----
Construction of buildings (appropriation)-----	1, 662, 000	1, 662, 000	1, 236, 500	1, 236, 500	-425, 500	-----
Total, Howard University-----	4, 262, 000	4, 262, 000	3, 867, 000	3, 817, 000	-445, 000	-50, 000
OFFICE OF EDUCATION						
Vocational education grants (George-Barden funds)-----	19, 977, 760	19, 875, 760	20, 017, 760	18, 223, 261	-1, 652, 499	-1, 794, 499
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts-----	2, 480, 000	2, 480, 000	2, 480, 000	2, 480, 000	-----	-----
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 477, 500	2, 477, 500	3, 550, 000	3, 253, 000	+775, 500	-297, 000
Payments to school districts (maintenance and operation)-----	23, 000, 000	23, 000, 000	28, 000, 000	28, 000, 000	+5, 000, 000	-----
Grants for surveys and school construction:						
Appropriation-----	24, 500, 000	24, 500, 000	75, 000, 000	75, 000, 000	+50, 500, 000	-----
Contract authority-----	[25, 000, 000]	[25, 000, 000]	-----	-----	[-25, 000, 000]	-----
Total, Office of Education-----	72, 435, 260	72, 333, 260	129, 047, 760	126, 956, 261	+54, 623, 001	-2, 091, 499
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION						
Payments to States-----	20, 600, 000	20, 600, 000	23, 000, 000	20, 475, 000	-125, 000	-2, 525, 000
Salaries and expenses-----	705, 000	705, 000	705, 000	705, 000	-----	-----
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation-----	21, 305, 000	21, 305, 000	23, 705, 000	21, 180, 000	-125, 000	-2, 525, 000

¹ This is a special, indefinite appropriation, representing fees expected to be collected in 1951 and 1952 to cover costs of the services rendered.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in general appropriation act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE						
Venereal diseases-----	\$14, 500, 000	\$12, 863, 500	\$11, 800, 000	\$11, 700, 000	—\$1, 163, 500	—\$100, 000
Tuberculosis-----	9, 800, 000	9, 400, 000	9, 000, 000	8, 745, 000	—655, 000	—255, 000
Assistance to States, general-----	16, 915, 000	16, 084, 000	16, 084, 000	15, 960, 000	—124, 000	—124, 000
Communicable diseases-----	6, 510, 600	6, 260, 600	6, 150, 000	6, 090, 000	—170, 600	—60, 000
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene.	3, 670, 030	3, 670, 030	3, 800, 000	3, 710, 000	+39, 970	—90, 000
Water pollution control grants-----	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	1, 000, 000	900, 000	—100, 000	—100, 000
Grants for plan preparation, water-pollution control ² -----	750, 000					
Administration expenses, water-pollution control ² -----	52, 285					
Alaska, disease and sanitation investigations and control-----	1, 259, 000	1, 234, 000	1, 234, 000	1, 234, 000		
Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati: ³						
Appropriation-----	1, 400, 000	1, 400, 000	2, 400, 000	2, 400, 000	+1, 000, 000	
Contract authority-----	[2, 400, 000]	[2, 400, 000]	[-----]	[-----]	[-----]	[-----]

Hospital construction:

Grants to States:

Appropriation:

Liquidation cash-----	100,000,000	100,000,000	120,000,000	100,000,000	-----	-20,000,000
Obligation cash-----	10,000,000	10,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	+65,000,000	-----
Contract authority-----	[150,000,000]	[75,000,000]	-----	-----	[-75,000,000]	[-----]
Salaries and expenses-----	1,357,000	1,257,000	1,220,000	1,195,000	-62,000	-25,000
Hospitals and medical care-----	29,050,000	29,024,000	30,200,000	30,200,000	+1,176,000	-----
Foreign quarantine service-----	3,104,000	3,004,000	3,000,000	2,990,000	-14,000	-10,000
National Institutes of Health-----	15,350,000	13,913,900	15,800,000	15,500,000	+1,586,100	-300,000
National Cancer Institute-----	20,486,000	19,886,000	19,947,000	19,500,000	-386,000	-447,000
Mental health activities-----	10,000,000	9,505,000	10,800,000	10,300,000	+795,000	-500,000
National Heart Institute-----	15,104,400	14,554,400	10,150,000	10,000,000	-4,554,400	-150,000
Dental health activities-----	2,090,000	1,954,850	1,750,000	1,500,000	-454,850	-250,000
Construction of research facilities:						
Appropriation-----	15,125,000	15,125,000	18,590,000	17,690,000	+2,565,000	-900,000
Contract authority-----	[350,000]	[350,000]	-----	-----	[-350,000]	-----

¹ Includes \$100,000 supplemental in H. Doc. 66.² Transferred from General Services Administration by Reorganization Plan No. 16 of 1950.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in general appropriation act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—continued						
Commissioned officers, pay, etc-----	\$1,790,000	\$1,790,000	\$1,900,000	\$1,900,000	+\$110,000	-----
Salaries and expenses, Public Health Service--	2,918,000	2,868,000	2,868,000	2,850,000	-18,000	-\$18,000
Total, Public Health Service-----	282,231,315	274,794,280	362,693,000	339,364,000	+64,569,720	-23,329,000
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL						
Salaries and expenses-----	2,005,000	2,005,000	2,135,000	2,135,000	+130,000	-----
Construction and equipment, infirmary building-----	100,000	100,000	-----	-----	-100,000	-----
Miscellaneous construction and replacements--	406,000	406,000	136,500	136,500	-269,500	-----
Construction and equipment, two treatment buildings:						
Appropriation-----	1,500,000	100,000	-----	-----	-100,000	-----
Contract authority-----	[3,938,000]	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital-----	4,011,000	2,611,000	2,271,500	2,271,500	-339,500	-----

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION					
Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, salaries and expenses:					
General fund appropriation-----	250, 000	250, 000	200, 000	175, 000	-75, 000
Annual indefinite (fees)-----	¹ [505, 402]	¹ [505, 402]	¹ [598, 000]	¹ [598, 000]	[+92, 598]
Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance:					
Salaries and expenses (trust fund limita- tion)-----	[56, 988, 000]	[56, 988, 000]	[60, 000, 000]	[58, 000, 000]	[+1, 012, 000]
Reimbursement to OASI trust fund-----	3, 694, 000	3, 694, 000	3, 734, 000	3, 734, 000	+40, 000
Bureau of Public Assistance:					
Grants (titles I, IV, X, and XIV)-----	1,280,000,000	1,280,000,000	1,300,000,000	1,250,000,000	-30, 000, 000
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 463, 400	1, 463, 400	1, 698, 000	1, 600, 000	+136, 600
Children's Bureau:					
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 592, 000	1, 450, 000	-50, 000
Grants to States, maternal and child welfare-----	30, 250, 000	30, 250, 000	33, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	-250, 000
Office of Commissioner, salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation-----	248, 000	248, 000	233, 000	219, 700	-28, 300
Transfer from OASI trust fund-----	[112, 000]	[112, 000]	[117, 000]	[110, 300]	[-1, 700]
Total, Social Security Administration-	1,317,405,400	1,317,405,400	1,340,457,000	1,287,178,700	-30, 226, 700
					-53,278,300

¹ Represents estimate of fees expected to be collected.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in general appropriation act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—Continued

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR						
Salaries, Office of Administrator:						
Appropriation-----	\$2, 364, 800	\$2, 364, 800	\$2, 419, 000	\$2, 279, 000	—\$85, 800	—\$140, 000
Transfer from OASI-----	[358, 900]	[358, 900]	[413, 000]	[403, 000]	[+ 44, 100]	[— 10, 000]
Service operations, salaries and expenses:						
Appropriation-----	1, 047, 600	1, 047, 600	780, 000	711, 500	—336, 100	—68, 500
Transfer from OASI-----	[191, 600]	[191, 600]	[135, 000]	[123, 500]	[— 68, 100]	[— 11, 500]
General Counsel, salaries:						
Appropriation-----	418, 540	418, 540	427, 000	412, 000	—6, 540	—15, 000
Transfers (Food and Drug and OASI) --	[405, 895]	[405, 895]	[423, 950]	[411, 950]	[+ 6, 055]	[— 12, 000]
Surplus property disposal and utilization----	333, 300	333, 300	333, 000	300, 000	—33, 300	—33, 000
Total, Office of Administrator-----	4, 164, 240	4, 164, 240	3, 959, 000	3, 702, 500	—461, 740	—256, 500
Total appropriations, Federal Security Agency-----	1, 714, 364, 115	1, 705, 220, 080	1, 874, 887, 260	1, 793, 226, 461	+ 88, 006, 381	—81, 660, 799

^a Consists of a total of \$1,739,387,090 appropriated to date to the Agency, adjusted as follows for transfers or shifts in functions and activities in order to place the 1951 amounts on a basis comparable with the 1952 budget estimates: \$2,202,285 transferred from General Services Administration under Reorganization Plan 16 of 1950; \$50,000 from Agriculture in connection with studies of effects of insecticides, etc., on human health; \$200,000 transferred to Agriculture in connection with research on plant sources of ACPH and Compound E; and a total of \$27,075,260 transferred to Labor under Reorganization Plan 19 of 1950, relating to the Bureau of Employees Compensation.

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses-----	\$8, 582, 500	\$8, 562, 500	\$8, 582, 500	\$8, 300, 000	--\$262, 500	--\$282, 500
----------------------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	---------------	--------------	--------------

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses-----	\$412, 200	\$409, 200	\$410, 000	\$400, 000	--\$9, 200	--\$10, 000
Arbitration and emergency boards-----	325, 000	325, 000	150, 000	150, 000	--175, 000	-----
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses-----	797, 300	764, 300	638, 000	600, 000	--164, 300	--38, 000
Total, National Mediation Board-----	1, 534, 500	1, 498, 500	1, 198, 000	1, 150, 000	--348, 500	--48, 000

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Railroad retirement appropriated account:						
Annual specific amount-----	¹ \$457,832,724	¹ \$438,004,924	-----	-----	--\$438,004,924	-----
Permanent indefinite amount-----	-----	-----	² \$613,000,000	\$613, 000, 000	+613, 000, 000	-----
Salaries and expenses (transfer from railroad retirement trust fund)-----	[5, 446, 000]	[5, 446, 000]	[5, 268, 000]	[5, 268, 000]	[--178, 000]	-----
Total, Railroad Retirement Board-----	¹ 457, 832, 724	¹ 438, 004, 924	² 613, 000, 000	613, 000, 000	+174, 995, 076	-----

¹ Does not include \$33,000,000 appropriated in 1950 act for the year 1951, for military service credits.² Does not include \$33,000,000 for 1952 carried in the 1950 act.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in general appropriation act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in bill for 1952	Bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214			1951, as reduced under sec. 1214	1952 estimates
Salaries and expenses-----	\$2, 949, 700	\$2, 949, 700	\$3, 247, 000	\$3, 047, 000	+ \$97, 300	—\$200, 000
Boards of inquiry-----	50, 000	50, 000	50, 000	50, 000	-----	-----
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service-----	2, 999, 700	2, 999, 700	3, 297, 000	3, 097, 000	+ 97, 300	— 200, 000
Grand total appropriations, all titles of bill-----	2, 423, 961, 899	2, 387, 192, 064	2, 732, 253, 760	2, 642, 279, 961	+ 255, 087, 897	— 89, 973, 799

○

Union Calendar No. 85

82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3709

[Report No. 322]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 13, 1951

Mr. FOGARTY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related
6 independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1952, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; teletype news service; and payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; \$1,425,000.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$1,650,000.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); and not to exceed \$75,000 for the

1 work of the President's Committee on National Employ
2 the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the
3 Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including purchase
4 of reports and of material for informational exhibits; and
5 expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants
6 at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of
7 Labor Standards; \$688,000.

8 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemploy-
9 ment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance
10 in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of
11 veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and
12 Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308),
13 the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army
14 Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as
15 amended, and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service
16 Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C., App. 459 (h)), and, under the
17 Act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App.
18 1472), of persons who have performed service in the
19 Merchant Marine, \$277,000.

20 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

21 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
22 the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging appren-
23 tice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937
24 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$2,692,000.

1 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
3 general administration of the employment service and un-
4 employment compensation programs, including temporary
5 employment of persons, without regard to the civil service
6 laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; for
7 cooperation with the United States Immigration and Natural-
8 ization Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and
9 carrying out agreements relating to the employment of foreign
10 agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and
11 when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force;
12 and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by
13 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
14 55a) ; \$4,635,500, of which \$743,500 shall be for carrying
15 into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602)
16 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

17 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and em-
18 ployment service administration: For grants in accordance
19 with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended
20 (29 U. S. C. 49-49n) , for carrying into effect section 602
21 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants
22 to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security
23 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503) , including, upon the
24 request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the
25 payment of rental for space made available to such State

1 in lieu of grants for such purpose, and for necessary expenses
2 in connection with the operation of employment office facil-
3 ities and services in the District of Columbia, \$165,560,000,
4 of which \$6,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that
5 the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs of ad-
6 ministration resulting from changes in a State law or increases
7 in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary
8 costs over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the
9 allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which
10 increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by
11 normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwith-
12 standing any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a)
13 of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of
14 Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary
15 of the Treasury for payment to each State found to
16 be in compliance with the requirements of the Act of
17 June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico
18 and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303
19 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts
20 as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient
21 administration of its unemployment compensation law and
22 of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That
23 such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department
24 of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for
25 the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly

1 determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail
2 matter in connection with the administration of unemploy-
3 ment compensation systems and employment services by
4 States receiving grants herefrom.

5 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
6 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
7 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment
8 and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis,
9 shall apply.

10 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
11 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
12 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
13 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
14 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
15 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
16 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
17 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
18 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
19 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
20 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
21 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

22 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
23 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
24 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,
25 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the

1 first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums
2 as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the
3 expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title
4 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the
5 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

6 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

7 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
8 expenses and not to exceed \$46,000 for the Employees'
9 Compensation Board of Appeals, \$1,947,000, together with
10 not to exceed \$122,000 to be derived from the War Claims
11 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of
12 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

13 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
14 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except
15 administrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing
16 during the current or any prior fiscal year, including pay-
17 ments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital
18 services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of
19 Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of bene-
20 fits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits"
21 in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947;
22 the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in
23 third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital
24 services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial
25 expenses, including transportation and other expenses inci-

1 dental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such
2 enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified
3 by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services
4 and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943,
5 and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian em-
6 ployees of the United States, and the limitations and author-
7 ity of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C.
8 796), shall apply in providing such services, treatment, and
9 expenses in such cases; \$30,000,000, together with not to
10 exceed \$5,000,000 to be derived from the War Claims
11 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of
12 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and to be available for payments
13 pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of such Act, which
14 amounts may be accounted for as one fund.

15 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
17 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to
18 State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for
19 services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services
20 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
21 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,243,000.

22 Revision of consumers' price index: For expenses nec-
23 essary to enable the Bureau to complete the revision of the
24 Consumers' Price Index, including temporary employees at
25 rates to be fixed by the Secretary without regard to the civil

1 service and classification laws and the Federal Employees
2 Pay Act of 1945, as amended; and services as authorized by
3 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;
4 \$1,000,000.

5 WOMEN'S BUREAU

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
7 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of
8 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of
9 reports and material for informational exhibits, \$389,000.

10 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

11 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-
12 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards
13 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide condi-
14 tions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts
15 by the United States, approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C.
16 38), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local
17 agencies and their employees for inspection services ren-
18 dered, and for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials
19 and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of
20 the Division, \$8,000,000.

21 GENERAL PROVISIONS

22 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for
23 salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic
24 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of

1 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for examination of esti-
2 mates of appropriations in the field, and for expenses of
3 attendance at meetings concerned with the function or
4 activity for which any such appropriation is made.

5 SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appro-
6 priation in this title may be transferred to any other
7 such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be in-
8 creased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer:
9 *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of
10 new functions within the Department.

11 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
12 Appropriation Act, 1952".

13 TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

14 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

15 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
16 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$115,000.

17 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

18 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of
19 Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services
20 and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements,
21 \$390,000.

22 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

23 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carry-
24 ing out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as

1 amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392, Public Law 459, approved
2 March 16, 1950) ; the Tea Importation Act, as amended
3 (21 U. S. C. 41-50) ; the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C.
4 141-149) ; the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C.
5 401-411) ; and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C.
6 61-64) ; including the purchase of not to exceed seven pas-
7 senger motor vehicles, of which two shall be for replace-
8 ment only; reporting and illustrating the results of
9 investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scien-
10 tific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment in advance
11 for special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of
12 fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new
13 developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement opera-
14 tions; \$5,345,000.

15 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-
16 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspec-
17 tion of certain products in accordance with sections 406, 504,
18 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug,
19 and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 354, 356,
20 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the advance
21 deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payment of
22 fees by applicants for certification or inspection of such prod-
23 ucts, to remain available until expended. The total amount
24 herein appropriated shall be available for personal services;

1 purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment;
2 and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has
3 been rendered.

4 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for
6 operation and maintenance, including repairs; purchase of
7 one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; furnishing,
8 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by
9 employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer
10 of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard
11 University" for salaries of technical and professional person-
12 nel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of
13 Howard University for instruction of nurses and actual cost
14 of heat, light, and power furnished by such university;
15 \$2,906,500: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician
16 receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-
17 time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages
18 or salary from any other appropriation in this title.

19 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

20 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of How-
21 ard University, including personal services and miscella-
22 neous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds,
23 \$2,525,000.

24 Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans
25 and specifications for construction, under the supervision of

1 the General Services Administration, on the grounds of
2 Howard University of a pharmacy building, including engi-
3 neering and architectural services, advertising, and travel,
4 \$55,500, to remain available until expended.

5 Construction of buildings: For construction of buildings
6 on the grounds of Howard University, under the supervision
7 of the General Services Administration, to remain available
8 until expended, as follows:

9 For construction of a pharmacy building, together with
10 alterations and installations in connection with such con-
11 struction, including engineering and architectural services,
12 and travel, \$904,500;

13 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
14 provided under this head in the First Deficiency Appropria-
15 tion Act, 1948, as amended by the Second Deficiency Ap-
16 propriation Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for construction
17 of an engineering building, \$332,000.

18 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

19 Promotion and further development of vocational edu-
20 cation: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the
21 Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section
22 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), and sec-
23 tion 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30)
24 and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462),
25 \$18,223,261: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the

1 States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall
2 be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$18,048,261 for
3 the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That no part of
4 this appropriation shall be available for vocational education
5 in distributive occupations.

6 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the
7 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22
8 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 329), \$2,480,000.

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
10 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations,
11 and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of
12 public and school library service; coordination of library
13 service on the national level with other forms of adult
14 education; developing library participation in Federal proj-
15 ects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials
16 among libraries, interstate library coordination and the devel-
17 opment of library service throughout the country; purchase,
18 distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-
19 picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and
20 cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles
21 of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative
22 of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education,
23 and repairing the same; \$3,253,000, of which not less than
24 \$500,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational
25 Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all receipts from

1 non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for ex-
2 penses of travel of employees of the Office of Education
3 performing advisory functions to said agencies shall be de-
4 posited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit
5 of this appropriation.

6 Payments to school districts: For payments to local
7 educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
8 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950
9 (Public Law 874), \$28,000,000.

10 Grants for school construction: For grants for emer-
11 gency school construction to school districts in feder-
12 ally affected areas as authorized by the Act of
13 September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), to remain avail-
14 able until expended, \$75,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 is
15 for payment of obligations incurred under authority provided
16 under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act,
17 1951: *Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall
18 be available for reimbursement payments under section 205
19 (c) (1) of such Act with respect to school facilities com-
20 pleted before July 1, 1951: *Provided further*, That in
21 determining relative urgency of need for purposes of pre-
22 scribing, under section 206 (d) of such Act, the order in
23 which certifications for payments from this appropriation
24 shall be made (other than payments in liquidation of con-
25 tractual obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1951), the

1 Commissioner shall give special consideration to the extent
2 to which the school facilities are needed in the interests of
3 national defense.

4 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

5 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
6 Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,
7 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Voca-
8 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4),
9 including payments, in accordance with regulations of the
10 Administrator, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the
11 acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accord-
12 ance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of
13 blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be con-
14 trolled by the State agency, \$20,475,000, of which not to
15 exceed \$175,000 shall be available to the Federal Security
16 Administrator for providing rehabilitation services to dis-
17 abled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by
18 section 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be available
19 for administrative expenses in connection with providing
20 such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That
21 not to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be
22 used for administrative purposes.

23 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
24 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after
25 May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in

1 accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as
2 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding
3 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding
4 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations
5 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged
6 to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*,
7 That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not
8 exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of
9 the current fiscal year.

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in car-
11 rying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation
12 Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936
13 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for
14 production, purchase, and distribution of educational films;
15 \$705,000.

16 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

17 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public
18 Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A)
19 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, includ-
20 ing (with the exception of the appropriation "Pay, and so
21 forth, commissioned officers, Public Health Service") pur-
22 chase of reports, documents, and other material for publica-
23 tion; preparation and display of posters and exhibits by con-
24 tract or otherwise; packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating,

1 drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commis-
2 sioned officers and transportation of their dependents on
3 change of station; and increased allowances to Reserve
4 officers for foreign service; as follows:

5 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
6 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases,
7 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
8 diagnosis, treatment, support, and clothing of persons afflicted
9 with venereal diseases; transportation and subsistence of such
10 persons and their attendants to and from the place of treat-
11 ment or allowance in lieu thereof; diagnosis and treatment
12 (including emergency treatment for other illnesses) of such
13 persons through contracts with physicians and hospitals and
14 other appropriate institutions; fees for case finding and
15 referral to such centers of voluntary patients; reasonable
16 expenses of preparing remains or burial of deceased patients;
17 recreational supplies and equipment; leasing of facilities
18 and repair and alteration of leased facilities; the purchase of
19 not to exceed fifteen passenger motor vehicles for replace-
20 ment only, and for grants of money, services, supplies,
21 equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the
22 Act, and with the approval of the respective State health
23 authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political
24 subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such

1 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
2 General may determine; \$11,700,000.

3 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
4 (b) of the Act, \$8,745,000.

5 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes
6 of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative serv-
7 ices to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make
8 field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section
9 301 of the Act; and to provide for collecting and compiling
10 mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics (including procure-
11 ment by contract of transcripts of State, municipal, and other
12 records), including the purchase of not to exceed ten pas-
13 senger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$15,960,000.

14 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-
15 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, 361,
16 and 704 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
17 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate
18 transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,
19 erection, and maintenace of portable buildings; the purchase
20 of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles and two
21 aircraft for replacement only; and hire, maintenance, and
22 operation of aircraft; \$6,090,000.

23 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For
24 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out

1 those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act
2 relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental
3 health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws
4 and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out
5 the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C.
6 466-466 (j)), including purchase of not to exceed eleven
7 passenger motor vehicles, of which nine shall be for replace-
8 ment only; \$3,710,000.

9 Grants, water pollution control: For grants to carry out
10 section 8 (a) of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S.
11 C. 466-466 (j)), \$900,000, to remain available until
12 expended.

13 Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Terri-
14 tory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,
15 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory
16 of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the inves-
17 tigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and
18 the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation
19 services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections
20 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of sub-
21 sections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth
22 in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704 of
23 the Act, including the purchase of one passenger motor
24 vehicle, and hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft,
25 \$1,234,000: *Provided*, That property of the Public Health

1 Service located in Alaska and used in carrying out the activi-
2 ties herein authorized may be transferred, without reimburse-
3 ment, to the Territory of Alaska at the discretion of the
4 Surgeon General.

5 Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio: For payment
6 of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under
7 the head "Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio," Gen-
8 eral Services Administration, in the Independent Offices
9 Appropriation Act, 1951, \$2,400,000, to remain available
10 until expended.

11 Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hos-
12 pital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as
13 amended, to remain available until expended, \$175,000,000,
14 of which \$100,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred
15 under authority heretofore granted under this head: *Pro-*
16 *vided*, That allotments under such part C to the several States
17 for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an
18 amount equal to that part of the appropriation granted herein
19 which is available for new obligations.

20 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
21 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
22 of the Act, as amended, including the purchase of not to
23 exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,
24 \$1,195,000.

1 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-
2 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8,
3 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324,
4 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the
5 Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of
6 February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm
7 products and livestock; purchase of not to exceed fifteen pas-
8 senger motor vehicles, including four ambulances, for replace-
9 ment only; and firearms and ammunition; \$30,200,000:
10 *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service establishes
11 or operates a health service program for any department or
12 agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in
13 advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

14 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
15 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing
16 the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign coun-
17 tries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with
18 section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of
19 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
20 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the
21 Public Health Service are not available, including insurance
22 of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required
23 by law of such countries; and the purchase of not to exceed

1 twelve passenger motor vehicles of which ten shall be for
2 replacement only; \$2,990,000.

3 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For
4 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-
5 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants
6 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; the
7 regulation and preparation of biologic products; the purchase
8 of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replace-
9 ment only; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visit-
10 ing scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon
11 General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of
12 adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH), cortisone, and other
13 chemical substances, and for development of other related
14 compounds; \$15,500,000.

15 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon
16 General, upon the recommendations of the National Ad-
17 visory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research
18 and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with
19 State health agencies, and other public and private non-
20 profit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradica-
21 tion of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstra-
22 tions, and grants-in-aid; for the purchase of not to exceed
23 four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and to

1 otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of
2 the Act; \$19,500,000, of which not less than \$4,625,000
3 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for
4 research and training grants incurred under authority here-
5 tofore granted under this head.

6 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for
7 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,
8 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,
9 \$10,300,000, of which not less than \$573,000 shall be avail-
10 able exclusively for payment of obligations for research and
11 training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted
12 under this head.

13 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
14 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including
15 the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles
16 for replacement only, \$10,000,000.

17 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
18 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to
19 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
20 diseases and conditions, \$1,500,000.

21 Construction of research facilities: For construction of
22 research facilities, to be transferred (except such part as may
23 be necessary for incidental expenses and purchase of equip-
24 ment by the Public Health Service) to the General Services

1 Administration, and to remain available until expended, as
2 follows:

3 For continuation of construction of a combined hospital
4 and research building as authorized under this head in the
5 Federal Security Agency Appropriation Acts of 1949 and
6 1950, \$10,400,000, of which \$10,000,000 is for payment of
7 obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under
8 this head.

9 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
10 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of
11 auxiliary service area structures, as authorized under this
12 head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
13 1950, \$300,000.

14 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
15 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of
16 additional auxiliary structures as authorized under this
17 head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
18 1951, \$350,000.

19 For purchase and installation of additional equipment,
20 supplies, and furnishings for structures heretofore provided
21 under this head, \$6,640,000.

22 Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth: For pay, uni-
23 forms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for
24 foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed

1 one thousand five hundred regular active commissioned
2 officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular
3 and reserve commissioned officers; for payment of claims for
4 private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or
5 damaged in the military service of the United States, as
6 authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 222c, h; 42 U. S. C. 213) ;
7 and for six months' death gratuity pay and burial payments
8 for regular commissioned officers; \$1,900,000, and the Sur-
9 geon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation
10 from appropriations made available to the Public Health
11 Service for the current fiscal year such additional amounts as
12 may be necessary for pay and allowances of the officers
13 herein authorized.

14 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the
15 Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses
16 of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere,
17 including conducting research on technical nursing standards
18 and furnishing consultative nursing services; preparing in-
19 formation, articles, and publications related to public health;
20 conducting studies and demonstrations in public health
21 methods; carrying on international health activities, including
22 not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other
23 countries when specifically authorized by the Surgeon Gen-
24 eral; and purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor
25 vehicles for replacement only; \$2,850,000.

1 SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
3 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including purchase
4 of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for re-
5 placement only, clothing for patients and cooperation with
6 organizations or individuals in scientific research into the
7 nature, causes, prevention, and treatment of mental illness,
8 \$2,135,000.

9 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:
10 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and
11 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prepa-
12 ration of plans and specifications, advertising, and super-
13 vision of construction, \$136,500, to remain available until
14 expended: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may
15 be transferred to the General Services Administration.

16 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

17 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions:
18 For expenses necessary for the supervision of Federal credit
19 unions, \$175,000, together with the aggregate of amounts
20 received from certificate, supervision, and examination fees
21 collected from Federal credit unions as authorized by law.

22 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Sur-
23 vivors Insurance: For necessary expenses, including pur-
24 chase of four passenger motor vehicles; and furnishing,
25 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment

1 used by building guards; not more than \$58,000,000 may
2 be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insur-
3 ance trust fund.

4 Reimbursement to Federal old-age and survivors in-
5 surance trust fund: For reimbursement to the Federal old-
6 age and survivors insurance trust fund for administrative
7 costs and for benefits paid during the period July 1, 1949
8 through August 31, 1950 to the survivors of veterans of
9 World War II eligible for benefits as provided under section
10 210 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C.
11 410), \$3,734,000.

12 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
13 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children,
14 aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally
15 disabled, as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the
16 Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7,
17 subch. I, IV, and X, 64 Stat. 477), \$1,250,000,000, of
18 which such amount as may be necessary shall be available
19 for grants for any period in the prior fiscal year subsequent
20 to March 31 of that year.

21 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance:
22 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
23 \$1,600,000.

24 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
25 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as

1 amended (29 U. S. C. 18a), and title V of the Social Security
2 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including
3 purchase of reports and material for the publications of the
4 Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution, \$1,450,-
5 000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation con-
6 tained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry
7 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care
8 of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons
9 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*
10 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed
11 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any
12 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so
13 long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*, That
14 any State plan which provides standards for professional
15 obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State
16 shall be approved.

17 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
18 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-
19 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as au-
20 thorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
21 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
22 \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State
23 pursuant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall
24 not be included in computing for the purposes of subsections
25 (a) and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount

1 expended or estimated to be expended by the State: *Pro-*
2 *vided further*, That this appropriation shall be allotted on a
3 pro rata basis among the several States in proportion to the
4 amounts to which the respective States are entitled for the
5 current fiscal year by reason of section 331 of the Social
6 Security Act Amendments of 1950.

7 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
8 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for
9 Social Security, \$219,700, together with not to exceed
10 \$110,300 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
11 survivors insurance trust fund.

12 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
13 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments
14 to States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respec-
15 tively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first
16 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may
17 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures
18 made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to
19 be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

20 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
21 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
22 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter
23 in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
24 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to
25 a State plan approved under such title prior to or during

1 such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect
2 to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which
3 such plan was submitted for approval.

4 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

5 Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office of
6 the Administrator, \$2,279,000, together with not to ex-
7 ceed \$403,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age
8 and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the
9 Administrator may advance to this appropriation from ap-
10 propriations of constituent organizations of the Federal
11 Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to finance
12 the regional office activities of such constituent organizations.

13 Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:
14 For expenses necessary for the Office of the Administrator,
15 including salaries for the Division of Service Operations; and
16 purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement
17 only; \$711,500, together with not to exceed \$123,500 to
18 be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors in-
19 surance trust fund: *Provided*, That the Administrator may
20 advance to this appropriation from appropriations of con-
21 stituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such
22 sums as may be necessary to cover the charges for services,
23 supplies, equipment, and materials furnished.

24 Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Salaries, Office of
25 the General Counsel, \$412,000, together with not to exceed

1 \$22,950 to be transferred from the appropriation "Salaries
2 and expenses, certification and inspection services", and not
3 to exceed \$389,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-
4 age and survivors insurance trust fund.

5 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for
6 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)
7 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of
8 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal
9 excess property for educational purposes and protection of
10 public health, \$300,000.

11 GENERAL PROVISIONS

12 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
13 salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of
14 estimates of appropriations in the field, and for payment
15 in advance when authorized by the Federal Security Ad-
16 ministrator for dues or fees for library membership in
17 organizations whose publications are available to members
18 only or to members at a price lower than to the general
19 public.

20 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
21 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
22 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
23 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

24 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available
25 for salaries and expenses shall be available for travel ex-

1 penses and for expenses of attendance at meetings con-
2 cerned with the function or activity for which any such ap-
3 propriation is made.

4 SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this
5 title to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid
6 of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
7 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses
8 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld
9 from the said agencies of any States which have established
10 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit sys-
11 tem and classification and compensation plan covering the
12 selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their em-
13 ployees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the
14 manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States,
15 or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

16 This title may be cited as the "Federal Security
17 Agency Appropriation Act, 1952".

18 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS

19 BOARD

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
21 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
22 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
23 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including
24 expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work
25 of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman

1 or the General Counsel; and services as authorized by section
2 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;
3 \$8,300,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation
4 shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agri-
5 cultural laborers or used in connection with investigations,
6 hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units
7 composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section
8 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as
9 amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947,
10 and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938
11 (52 Stat. 1060).

12 This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations
13 Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

14 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

15 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
16 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
17 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
18 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) , \$400,000.

19 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses nec-
20 essary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of
21 the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157),
22 and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant
23 to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including

1 stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
2 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$150,000.

3 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
5 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
6 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
7 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$600,000, of which not
8 less than \$250,000 shall be available for compensation
9 (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of
10 referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway
11 Labor Act, as amended.

12 This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board
13 Appropriation Act, 1952".

14 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

15 Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual
16 premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions,
17 and death benefits in accordance with the provisions of the
18 Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended
19 (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the
20 Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said Acts
21 as may be specifically authorized annually in appropriation
22 Acts, there is hereby appropriated for crediting monthly to
23 the railroad retirement account for the fiscal year 1952, and

1 for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to the amount
2 covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during each such
3 fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (26
4 U. S. C. 1500-1538): *Provided*, That the appropriation
5 made herein for the fiscal year 1952 shall be adjusted by the
6 Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Bureau
7 of the Budget, in such manner as may be necessary to insure
8 that the railroad retirement account shall be credited for an
9 amount equal to the amounts covered into the Treasury
10 (minus refunds) prior to July 1, 1951, under said Railroad
11 Retirement Tax Act and under the Carriers Taxing Act of
12 1937, as amended, less (1) amounts credited as premiums
13 to the railroad retirement account (excluding \$334,429,100
14 heretofore appropriated for military service credits) and
15 (2) amounts properly chargeable as administrative expenses
16 of the Railroad Retirement Board, prior to July 1, 1951.

17 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
18 fund): For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
19 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of at-
20 tendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board
21 when specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic
22 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
23 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$5,268,000, to be
24 derived from the railroad retirement account.

1 This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement
2 Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

3 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND
4 CONCILIATION SERVICE

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
6 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
7 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180,
8 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
9 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-
10 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor
11 relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of
12 attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial
13 relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the
14 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$3,047,000.

15 Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay neces-
16 sary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the Presi-
17 dent pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management
18 Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176-180, 182), includ-
19 ing services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
20 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of
21 Columbia, \$50,000.

22 This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and
23 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1952".

1 TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

2 SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in
3 this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
4 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
5 the United States or who is a member of an organization
6 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
7 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
8 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
9 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
10 force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an
11 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the
12 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions
13 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of
14 the United States, is not a member of an organization of
15 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against
16 the Government of the United States, or that such person
17 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
18 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
19 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That
20 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
21 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
22 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
23 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
24 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
25 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by

1 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
2 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained
3 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,
4 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not
5 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the
6 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
7 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

8 SEC. 702. This Act may be cited as the "Labor-Federal
9 Security Appropriation Act, 1952".

INDEX

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

	Page
Apprenticeship, Bureau of.....	3
Employees' Compensation, Bureau of.....	7
Employment Security, Bureau of.....	4
General provisions	9
Labor Standards, Bureau of.....	2
Labor Statistics, Bureau of.....	8
Secretary's office.....	2
Solicitor's office.....	2
Veterans' Reemployment Rights, Bureau of.....	3
Wage and Hour Division.....	9
Women's Bureau.....	9

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Administrator, Office of.....	31
American Printing House for the Blind.....	10
Columbia Institution for the Deaf.....	10
Education, Office of.....	13
Food and Drug Administration.....	10
Freedmen's Hospital	12
General provisions	32
Howard University	12
Public Health Service.....	17
Saint Elizabeths Hospital.....	27
Social Security Administration.....	27
Vocational Rehabilitation, Office of.....	16

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses.....	33
----------------------------	----

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Arbitration and emergency boards.....	34
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses.....	35
Salaries and expenses, Mediation Board.....	34

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Railroad retirement account.....	35
Salaries and expenses (trust fund).....	36

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses.....	37
Boards of inquiry.....	37

82ND CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3709

[Report No. 322]

A BILL

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

By Mr. FOGARTY

APRIL 13, 1951

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. Speaker, I am one who is not afraid that our countries to the south will not stand with us in this time of grave peril. Our hemisphere is united and will stand united.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the members of our Foreign Affairs Committee on the splendid and appropriate emphasis they are making this day on the floor of this great legislative body as to the cordial, friendly understanding and good will between all the pan-American nations.

My birth, together with my lifelong residence, having been in the Golden State of California, I probably have more awareness of the vitality toward international peace and comity, which comes from mutual exchange of mutual respect, and of mutual interdependence and confidence as extended one nation to another, than otherwise would be possible.

My home is at Long Beach, Los Angeles County, and into the important Long Beach-Los Angeles Harbor come many, many ships of the sea from pan-American countries to the south of my native State. It has been my pleasure to learn to know more or less personally some of the residents of these other pan-American nations. Some of them now reside in my home city.

I well recall the esteem and high regard which came to me as a result of knowing residents of those South American countries who participated in the American Olympic games in 1932 in Los Angeles. In relation thereto, I had the honor and responsibility of then being the Long Beach chairman of the arrangements for the magnificent and inspiring rowing races of those Olympic games; all of which rowing races were held in the famous Long Beach rowing stadium which then and now is under the jurisdiction of the Long Beach Recreation Commission, a charter-created commission of the important city of Long Beach—my home city, if you please, and of which I am very proud.

These oarsmen, Mr. Speaker, of the southern countries in their rowing races were distinctly proud and capable and achieved a great deal throughout the country to the end of comity and good will, and also throughout the amateur sports world. I found all of those athletes from the southern Pan-American nations most cordial and sincere in their expressions of esteem and high regard for the peoples of the United States and for the United States Government itself. Another incident which was really inspiring to me was the occasion at the Ford Theater, Washington, D. C., where Abraham Lincoln was unfortunately assassinated, when the distinguished son of Alafaro, the former president of Peru, presented a magnificent bust of his distinguished father to the Abraham Lincoln Museum collection at the Ford Theater. It was my very great pleasure to preside at that meeting.

For your further information, I will say that Alafaro, the deceased president of our friends to the south, was commonly known in his lifetime as the Abraham Lincoln of South America. His distinguished descendants and admirers

in South America have created the Alafaro Foundation in his memory because he is still known as the Abraham Lincoln of South America.

Mr. Speaker, it should be everlastingly significant that the highest tribute which his direct descendants and fellow citizens attribute to this former president of this pan-American nation is that he was likened to our own worthy President, Abraham Lincoln.

So, I am pleased to make these extemporaneous remarks. I extend to all the peoples in all the nations of the Pan-American lands and areas, my cordial greetings and high esteem and best wishes. When peoples know one another, their chance of becoming friends is much improved.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point on this subject, and include some supplementary and editorial material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CRAWFORD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with the other Members of the House in paying tribute to the people of South and Central America.

I particularly want to pay my tribute to one of the greatest leaders South America ever produced. I refer to General Estegarribia, former President of Paraguay. Something like 20 or 25 years ago certain big oil interests undertook to force an outlet to the Pacific Ocean for the oil interests in Bolivia. You remember the fight over Tacna and Arica, two small areas on the west coast of South America, one in southern Peru and the other in northern Chile. Those countries would not give them up.

Finally, after years of bickering, they got the Bolivian Army together and started to drive down through Paraguay to the Parana River so as to get out to the Atlantic. General Estegarribia, the President of Paraguay, gathered his army together, and ran them back onto Bolivian soil. In the meantime that other Tower of Babel in Europe, known as the League of Nations, branded Paraguay as the aggressor. John D. Rockefeller had given the League of Nations the building in which to operate. When Estegarribia drove them out of Paraguay, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, Senator Huey Long, took the floor and exposed the whole scheme, the whole operation, and showed the injustice the League of Nations had done in branding Paraguay as the aggressor. His speech created such a world repercussion that the heads of the government of South America called a meeting and stopped that war.

I did not want this opportunity to pass without mentioning this incident. Estegarribia was later killed in an airplane accident, together with his wife. I have

always thought that his plane was sabotaged.

Estegarribia was the greatest military leader South America has produced since Bolivar. He contributed more toward checking this international attempt to interfere in the domestic affairs of the various countries than any other man of his day.

I did not want this opportunity to pass without somebody paying tribute to this great South American leader, for his great contribution to the peace and security of South America, in blocking the efforts of that Tower of Babel, known as the League of Nations, and certain big oil interests, to plunge his country into war, or subordinate his people to the domination of foreign powers.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it is only fitting and proper that the House of Representatives pause today in commemoration of Pan-American Day, which took place a few days ago, this being the first opportunity for the House to officially conduct exercises in connection with the celebration of Pan-American Day of this year.

The very fact that the House of Representatives pauses to recognize Pan-American Day and the speeches made today constitute a powerful message of understanding, of respect, and of friendship from the people and the Government of the United States to the people and the several governments of South America.

The United States and other countries of South America are committed to the good-neighbor policy. It takes a long while for such a policy to make progress. We should not despair in our efforts and in our patience, not only the United States but the governments of South America, in those negotiations and those results that from time to time will represent progress in more firmly establishing the good-neighbor policy between the countries of the Western Hemisphere.

The exercises of this day have a far greater significance than last year and previous years. The exercises take place at a time when world history is in the making and when critical conditions exist throughout the world that constitute serious problems to the leaders and the peoples of all countries; and I think we might stress today the significance of the unity of action and unity of objective; because, after all, the people of our country and the people of the several South American countries have the same common heritage. Despite the difference in our forms of government, we have the same common purpose; and I think an appreciation of the common heritage that is ours and the common objective that we seek and the existence of an understanding mind on the part of the responsible officials of the several governments of the Western Hemisphere will bring about results not only favorable to our country and the Western Hemisphere, but also favorable to the world at large.

I am particularly pleased, and as some of the speakers have made reference to

it, that on this occasion my very dear friend and one whom I admire very much, Father Joseph F. Thorning, was invited by our Chaplain, Dr. Braskamp, to offer prayer on this specific day, having in mind particularly the exercises in relation to Pan-American Day. That shows the understanding mind that exists among our people: Dr. Braskamp, a minister of one faith inviting Father Thorning, a Catholic priest, to offer prayer on this particular occasion. That of itself has a depth that we all appreciate and constitutes a message that will be clearly understood by the peoples of the several countries of South America as well as our own country.

Father Thorning is one of the outstanding priests of the Catholic Church and an outstanding American. It is not my purpose to dwell upon him at length, because as he is present on the floor of the House and knowing his modest nature, I am aware of the fact that I would subject him to pleasant embarrassment. But I know of the work that Dr. Thorning has done in the strengthening and the increasing of the good neighbor policy between our country and the countries of South America. I think I might term him, and term him properly, the "missionary of good will," not only in South America, but in North America in fostering better understanding between the peoples and the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Certainly his missionary mind as a priest has been strongly evidenced in the missionary work he has done here and in South America in strengthening and advancing the good neighbor policy. We of America appreciate what he has done, and I know the people of South America do also. The exercises conducted today will have a stimulating effect throughout the Western Hemisphere.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RICHARDS], to offer a resolution.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 200) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas April 14, the founding date of the Pan American Union 61 years ago by the First International Conference of American States in Washington, has been designated Pan-American Day and is traditionally observed by the legislatures of the American Republics; and

Whereas the Pan American Union, now secretariat of the Organization of American States, has enlarged its program for the promotion of economic, social, juridical, and cultural relations, as set forth in the Charter of the Organization of American States; and

Whereas the House of Representatives is of the conviction that pan-American solidarity, based on friendship, mutual understanding, and cooperation among the States of this hemisphere, is of the highest importance to the welfare and progress of the peoples of the Americas and to the world as a whole: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extend its most cordial greetings to the representative bodies of each of the other American States on the occasion of Pan-American Day, in recognition of the democratic ideals shared by the nations of the Americas and in reaffirmation of hemispheric unity.

Copies of the present resolution shall be distributed through appropriate channels to the legislatures of the other American States and to the Secretary General of the Organization of American States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The House resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACQUISITION AND DISPOSITION OF LAND BY ARMY, NAVY, AIR FORCE, AND FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 198, Rept. No. 328), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3096) relating to the acquisition and disposition of land and interests in land by the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Federal Civil Defense Administration. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL INSTALLATIONS

Mr. LYLE, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 199, Rept. No. 329), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3464) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain naval installations, and for other purposes. That after general debate which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill continue today, the time to be divided and controlled equally between the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] and myself, and that the first paragraph may be read before the Committee rises today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3709, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 35 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am very happy and privileged to bring before the committee this afternoon for its consideration the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year 1952.

At the outset may I say that I do not believe there is a committee in the House of Representatives, whether it be a legislative committee or another subcommittee on appropriations, that has been more diligent or more sincere in its deliberations than has this particular subcommittee during the past 2 months in arriving at the recommendations we are going to present to you this afternoon. As you know, the membership of the subcommittee was increased in number from five to seven. We held hearings for about 5 weeks, sitting continuously. In other years we sometimes adjourned over from 1 day to another due to the fact the House was not in session or because we had other pressing business to attend to, but this year for the first time since I have been a member of this Subcommittee on Appropriations we did not miss 1 day of hearings from the time we started until we finished. The attendance of the various subcommittee members was practically 100 percent.

I received excellent cooperation from Members on the Democratic side and the Members on the Republican side, and I could not ask for any better relationship than existed between the members of the subcommittee. We have as the ranking minority member of the subcommittee this year the gentleman from Okla-

homa [Mr. SCHWABE] who takes the place of Mr. Keefe, of Wisconsin, who retired last year. I had the privilege of serving with the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE] on this committee during the Eightieth Congress. I do not believe there is a more sincere, a more able minority Representative than is the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE]. I am very happy to see him back this year.

Mr. Chairman, we believe we have a good bill to present to the House. We believe that we have shown a keen sense of economy that will stand up in general debate and when the bill is read under the 5-minute rule tomorrow, at which time it will be open for amendment. I think that speaks well for the committee, and I know I speak for the committee this afternoon when I say we are proud to have such a bill to send to the House, and that a great deal of credit must be given to our very efficient and able Clerk, Paul Wilson, who has been with this committee for the past 5 years. He has been very diligent. He knows all of the ins and outs of the agencies represented in this appropriation bill, and he has done a splendid job for the committee. This year for the first time we had an Assistant Clerk, Carson Culp, who has been of outstanding value to the committee and has done a very able job in his first year.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion this is one of the most difficult appropriation bills on which to show greater economy recommendations. I do not believe you will consider an appropriation bill this year that will have more appeal to the general public and to humanity, not only in this country, but throughout the world, than this bill.

There are many, many places in this bill where the committee's hands are tied and we cannot show substantial savings. By that I mean when the legislation was enacted they made certain determinations, particularly in grants to States, that we have to match when expenditures are made by the States, and the committee has no control over the appropriations in that particular respect. All in all, it looks like a big bill and the percentage cut does not look very large, but outside of the grants to the States and those sums where the committee has virtually no control I think we have cut more out of this bill this year than this subcommittee has ever cut since I have been a member of it. We have, in fact, made some reductions in several grant items, but there are certain inescapable limitations on the extent to which we can go as a committee.

I think the easiest way to follow the bill will be to refer to the report. On page 2 you will see a summary of the estimates and appropriations. Then on page 3 we have a table showing the breakdown for the Department of Labor and then on page 7 we show a breakdown for the Federal Security Agency. You will note on the top of page 2 that grand total appropriations recommended by the budget for 1952 were \$2,732,253,760. The committee is recommending \$2,642,279,961, or a reduction of

\$89,973,799 in the estimates presented. This over-all amount includes, under the Railroad Retirement Board, an increase of \$174,995,076 included in a \$613,000,000 item. This item has given the committee a great deal of concern for the past 2 or 3 years and we have given considerable study to it. This is an item that should not be included in this particular bill and therefore in the table on page 2 of the report, to give more realistic figures of what we are recommending in the way of true charges on the general revenue, the appropriation for the Railroad Retirement Board, you will note, is not included in the totals. I think you know that this is not an appropriation out of the general revenues, in the usual sense, but represents taxes imposed upon railroad employees and the railroads which are collected and put into the Treasury and then made available to the railroad retirement trust fund. But the way it has been handled in the past it does cost the Federal Government—that is, the general taxpayer—about \$4,500,000 for interest charges on the money the Treasury borrows in order to advance funds to the Board before the taxes are collected from the employees and the employers. We have never been able to guess—and that is what it amounts to—accurately a year or more in advance what those tax collections would be, so in the bill we recommend a new method of appropriation to cure the situation and at the same time make a savings of about \$4,500,000 a year. Therefore, as I said, we have set that item aside and not added it in the totals—it distorts them when we include it.

You will notice in the Department of Labor for 1951 they had available \$230,906,360.

The budget estimates for 1952 are \$231,289,000. * The committee bill is \$223,506,500, which shows a reduction from the budget estimates of \$7,782,500. And I think one of the most significant things we can point out to the House is that we show not only a cut below the budget estimates for 1952 but in practically every agency of the Department of Labor we also show a reduction from what they had available in 1951. I think that is important, and I hope Members will take note of that fact and keep it in mind. You do not always see that.

In order to show that, if you will refer to the latter part of the report and follow the various items right down you will see the cuts in the budget estimates, and then in the next to the last column you will see the cuts below 1951 for each appropriation. In practically every agency we show a cut below 1951. That is why I say I think this committee has done a splendid job. As I said, you do not always see that.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Percentage-wise, how much have you reduced this bill as compared with the request of the budget?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot give a realistic answer to that question, offhand, because of the situation in which we find

ourselves. If the gentleman will bear with me for just a few minutes, and if he will follow me on page 3, the table in the report dealing with the Department of Labor, I will indicate what I mean.

The Department of Labor asked this year for \$231,289,000, which is an increase of \$300,000-plus over what they had available in 1951. However, out of that \$231,289,000, you will see in the first item, grants to States for employment security program, \$165,560,000, which is 74 percent of the entire total for the Department. We cut that item \$4,000,000, but that again is something that is not a charge on the general revenues, but is a tax of three-tenths of 1 percent that is applied on employers for administration purposes. I may say that even though they would have \$165,560,000 to spend in this coming fiscal year for the employment security program in all the States, for administrative purposes, they expect to collect in taxes some \$97,000,000 more than that. That excess would be in the Federal Treasury. Every year we show a surplus over what is being spent for administration as compared to the tax collection.

What I am trying to stress is that just one item in the Department of Labor, which we must provide for, amounts to 74 percent of the total appropriations for the Department.

The next item is the employees injury compensation fund, which shows an amount of \$30,000,000. That is another amount over which we have virtually no control. When covered Federal employees are injured in line of duty we have to meet what has been determined to be the cost of their injury benefit payments. The present expenditure rate is running at about \$2,500,000 a month. Last year we cut them about \$3,000,000, but we had to give them a supplemental appropriation only a few weeks ago of \$3,000,000 to meet the obligations. That item amounts to another 14 percent.

So, in the Department of Labor, 88 percent of total appropriations is made up of those two items about which there is nothing that the committee can do. That leaves just 12 percent for all other items, which in the committee bill totals \$27,946,500. That is a cut of \$2,782,500 below estimates and \$2,820,860 below 1951. That is practically a 10 percent cut.

Referring to the Federal Security Agency on page 7, of the report, we see practically the same situation. For the Federal Security Agency the budget gave us an estimate of \$1,874,887,260. The committee bill allows \$1,793,226,461, which is a cut of \$81,660,799, and which is also \$14,743,619 below what they had in 1951. I want to emphasize that—we have not been content to merely show savings below estimates, but we have also made cuts which in total bring the bill below 1951 amounts.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. With reference to the cut that the gentleman just mentioned, is that with respect to employment?

Mr. FOGARTY. Does the gentleman have reference to the Department of Labor?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Yes, my understanding was that they are asking for more employees than they had last year. How in the world did you take care of that?

Mr. FOGARTY. I remember where someone had said they read in the newspaper that they were asking for five-hundred-and-some-odd more employees for the Department of Labor.

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is right.

Mr. FOGARTY. That was for defense activities, and as the gentleman perhaps remembers, a week ago we had the appropriation bill before us for the defense agencies, and, as I remember, the only thing that was granted for the Department of Labor was in the apprenticeship training program. All of those requests were cut out by the House only last week when we had the defense agencies appropriation bill before us.

With reference to what the gentleman mentioned about the hiring of 500 additional men, that was not in the going program. That was for some project in the future, because of defense items which they tried to justify before the committee only within the last 2 or 3 weeks, before a special subcommittee which was set up for that purpose.

Mr. REES of Kansas. What I am trying to find out is whether or not the cut or the reduction here might be made up, as the gentleman just suggested, in an appropriation for the Department of Defense or some other agency. In other words, I was just wondering if the appropriation was being shifted about or whether it is a real cut.

Mr. FOGARTY. No, the cut that we are justifying today is a cut against the going department programs. It has nothing to do with the defense activities of the Department of Labor.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. FORD. In the hearing it was brought out that there were 88 projects under the Hospital Construction Act which were in need of funds because of prior commitments of one sort or another. As I understand the bill, those 88 projects, if the appropriations are left as they are, will receive their Federal contribution. Is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me explain it this way. Under the bill we make no demands on the agency for that at all. There are those 88 projects throughout the country. Those 88 projects particularly were affected by the cutbacks made by the Budget Bureau last fall. They are prospects where they had already acquired the land and had plans drawn and had borrowed or otherwise obtained the money for their share. Many of them are paying interest on the money they have borrowed. It will cost about \$33,000,000 as the Federal share to complete those 88 projects. Those projects are not determined, the priority is not determined, on the Federal level. The priority is determined by the State Hos-

pital Authority, however it is set up in a particular State. I would presume, as I think the other members of the subcommittee presume, that the \$75,000,000 that we are appropriating for this next fiscal year for projects will be handled that way. The 88 projects will no doubt get top priority in the States, and they will I assume be the first ones to be taken care of in this next fiscal year. I would presume that would be the case.

Mr. FORD. Has the handling of those cases been materially helped by the transfer of \$75,000,000 from contract authorizations to a cash expenditure?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. That has nothing at all to do with it. As you know, the law authorized \$75,000,000 a year until the Congress changed it 2 years ago. At that time they authorized \$150,000,000 for hospital construction; but the Bureau of the Budget allowed only \$75,000,000. What we are doing now is getting away from contract authorizations, committing future Congresses, and we are simply appropriating actual cash. Last year we had \$75,000,000 contract authorization for this particular program. That has been wiped out. We are appropriating actual cash this year instead of giving contract authority.

Now, continuing with the Federal Security Agency as I did with the Department of Labor. If you will follow this table on page 7, you will see just what I mean.

The first item listed there is public assistance grants, \$1,300,000,000 estimate. That item in the bill is 70 percent of total appropriations for the Federal Security Agency, and we cannot do anything about it. We are bound by law to match the money that is put up by the States. As an appropriations committee we cannot do anything about it unless you change the basic law.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I notice it says the committee allowed \$1,250,000,000, which would appear to be a less amount than the estimate.

Mr. FOGARTY. It is \$50,000,000 below the estimate, because of the amendments to the Social Security Act which the Congress passed a year ago. By liberalizing the social-security law, a number of people dropped off the public-assistance rolls in various States. As a consequence they will need less, as we see it. They will not be putting up as much money in 1952. This budget was gotten up several months ago when the rate of unemployment throughout the country was higher than it is today, before the social-security amendments had taken full effect. Also, the new program for aid to needy disabled has not gotten underway as rapidly as first anticipated. They are not going to spend all of their current appropriation. We have attempted, in recommending \$1,250,000,000 to set forth what appears to be the total needed to match State and local expenditures.

Mr. VORYS. So the difference between the estimate and the committee bill, \$50,000,000, is not a cut in the amount that is needed for public assistance?

Mr. FOGARTY. Not a cut as to needs in individual cases.

Mr. VORYS. As you say, that is fixed by law?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right. We have to match State and local expenditures. We think we have allowed enough to do that. That one item takes up 70 percent of the Federal Security Agency total.

The second item listed is school construction and maintenance in federally impacted areas. That is something new that this committee had to take up this year. That is 6 percent of the total. We have never had that in the bill before. It shows an increase in this bill of \$55,500,000 over 1951 funds to date. The Congress last year passed Public Laws 815 and 874, dealing with the construction of schools in impacted areas and on Federal property, due to the defense and other Federal activities. Just one class of projects can be illustrated by reference to school facilities in such areas as the atomic energy project in South Carolina. Those types—and they are relatively small, dollarwise—are estimated at \$18,000,000 for school facilities. The law which gives Federal aid to those impacted areas for maintenance of schools is another item over which we have virtually no control. The purpose of the bills was to take from the Department of the Interior, the Defense Department, and other agencies, all of these school activities and center them in one place. It shows a huge increase in our bill this year. Although we are giving them \$103,000,000 for those two bills in 1952, they told us in the hearings that they had sent a request to the Bureau of the Budget for an additional \$100,000,000 for expenditure in fiscal year 1951. Only 3 days ago I learned that the Bureau of the Budget had allowed \$50,000,000 of that request, and that \$50,000,000 request has gone to the Senate because we had concluded hearings on the supplemental bill.

That is another place where our hands are tied. The next place is on the hospital-construction program.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. In just a minute; I want to finish this item and then I will return.

The other is the hospital-construction program, which is 10 percent of the total. That shows an increase of \$65,000,000, but that is without the contractual obligations that we have had in prior years. We are appropriating in 1952 on a cash basis. That is why that shows as an increase this year. In future years it will not show as an increase because we are getting away from contract authority in favor of cash and against committing future Congresses to something that we might do. So those three items in Federal Security amount to 86 percent of the total. That leaves 14 percent for all other items, including the entire public health program, including the George-Barden Vocational Education Act, including the Children's Bureau, vocational rehabilitation, and all other items where we give grants to States. We have cut the estimates for those items by \$11,660,799. That is also \$2,493,619 below

what they had in 1951. Here again we not only cut below the 1952 budget estimates but we go below what they had to operate with in 1951.

So, in the total appropriations for Federal Security, we cut \$81,660,799 below the Bureau of the Budget, but the total is \$88,006,381 over what they have available in 1951 up to date. However, when we subtract the \$102,750,000 in contract authority they had in 1951, but will not have in 1952, it shows a reduction of \$14,743,619 below what they have so far in fiscal year 1951.

I now yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Getting back to the grants for school aid in the federally impacted areas. I notice the gentleman stated that last year was the first appropriations made for construction grants and for maintenance and operation in federally impacted areas under Public Laws 815 and 874, is not that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. PERKINS. Those laws were enacted during the Eighty-first Congress.

Mr. FOGARTY. For construction in 1951 fiscal, we appropriated \$24,500,000 and gave them contract authority of \$25,000,000. They are going to a straight cash basis in 1952 fiscal.

Mr. PERKINS. Can the gentleman tell the membership of this committee whether or not the Office of Education now has hundreds of applications that they cannot do anything with or grant any funds in these various areas throughout the United States because of the insufficiency of the appropriation? Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is correct. They testified before the committee—and this was several weeks ago—that they had just adopted a policy of refusing to take, or approve, further applications. As I remember, they set February 28, 1951, as the cut-off date because they had no money to cover applications after that date. That, in essence, was the situation when we held the hearings.

Mr. PERKINS. And because of the inadequacy of the appropriation during the past year no applications were considered or honored after February of this year—because of lack of funds.

Mr. FOGARTY. That in essence is correct. But perhaps you could not blame them, and you could not blame the Committee on Appropriations because we did not last fall know what the full requirements were going to be, and in fact, do not yet know exactly what the total will be. When the Government makes determinations to reopen military installations and operate these new war plants in various areas, I think the local communities expect the Federal Government to pay its share and to see to it that these school children get an adequate education.

Mr. PERKINS. And if the increased appropriation is not granted which the gentleman has spoken in favor of this afternoon, or referred to, communities like Paducah and other communities throughout the country will be severely handicapped from an educational standpoint.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. PERKINS. And will have no means to meet the situation brought about by this impact unless funds are granted which are recommended by the Office of Education.

Mr. FOGARTY. We have granted the full budget estimate. We have not cut them one dime. Also, as I said a few minutes ago, the Bureau of the Budget recommended another \$50,000,000 for fiscal 1951. That has been referred to the Senate because we had concluded our hearings.

Mr. PERKINS. Does the gentleman know that the Office of Education has undertaken to set up a priority system on these applications because of inadequate funds and as a result very few areas have received relief to any appreciable extent?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I am sure the gentleman remembers a couple of years ago when this proposition was first presented to the House that a \$10,000,000 appropriation was requested and at that time a number of Members raised the point that if this appropriation were made, that is, if the appropriation of \$10,000,000 were made, in a few years it would be \$50,000,000 or \$100,000,000 and soon possibly hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. FOGARTY. They tentatively estimate this construction program at \$380,000,000. That is in the hearings.

Mr. JENSEN. Yes. The gentleman can see, I am sure, if the committee which he so ably presides over does not hold down the request for such appropriations there will be demands from all over America to the tune of a billion dollars. Now, did the committee go into the matter to determine whether the businessmen who are in business in those congested areas around these national defense installations are paying their share of taxes for the education of the children and for other things pertaining to the expenses of the project?

Mr. FOGARTY. We did.

Mr. JENSEN. What did the gentleman find out?

Mr. FOGARTY. The facts as to that are in the printed hearings. I remember going into that particular phase of it, and other members of the committee did at the same time. I have that situation in my own State.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman realizes that a lot of money is being made by merchants in those areas and, in my opinion, the Congress should see to it that those merchants pay their fair share of the taxes which are necessary to carry on those school facilities, because if you do not one of these fine days, as the Government expands, every town, every place, in the country will be asking for a war installation for the sole purpose of ducking its tax responsibility.

Mr. FOGARTY. I may say at this point that when the bill was up last fall, the House conferees cut in half what the Senate had allowed. That is, to \$24,000,000 plus. An amendment was offered in

the House to restore those cuts. I attempted to defend the cuts at that time to the best of my ability, but we were outvoted about 4 to 1.

Mr. JENSEN. I was not one of the Members who voted to increase it. I remember the gentleman who is now addressing the Committee did try his best to stop the increase, for which I congratulate him.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman will find that the formula set forth in Public Laws 815 and 874, Eighty-first Congress, clearly defines what a Federal impacted project is. Before any affected area can qualify for Federal assistance the area must meet all of the requirements set forth in those laws, and you will find that those requirements are very rigid. For instance, the children of personnel at military and defense installations must be overcrowding schools near the installations. And then again the area not only has to be paying its fair share of taxes, but you will find that because of the loss of real estate taken over by the Federal Government, that that is one of the conditions that brings about this Federal impact.

Mr. JENSEN. But you must remember that because of the Federal installations moving in there that all of the property advances in value one, two, three, four, five hundred to one thousand percent.

Mr. PERKINS. That, too, is taken into consideration. The point is that the impact brought about by world conditions is so much greater now than it was a year ago or 2 years ago.

Mr. JENSEN. I recognize the need to take care of these impacted districts but certainly I want the people who are profiting directly from this program of war installations to pay their fair share of taxes, and I am afraid too many of them are not doing so.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I call attention to pages 8 and 9 of the committee report dealing with the Office of Education and call attention particularly to lines 3 to 5 on page 14 of the bill which provides that "no part of the appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations." I call the attention of the chairman to two telegrams I received from prominent educators in my State and read them. Will the distinguished subcommittee chairman please give explanatory reply to these two telegrams from these distinguished educators?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. DOYLE. May I just briefly read these two short telegrams?

Mr. FOGARTY. Why does not the gentleman put them in the RECORD? I know what they are, and I will answer his question.

Mr. DOYLE. Will the gentleman tell us briefly why the appropriation for distributive education is eliminated? I

read from your report on page 9. I received a telegram authorized by the able superintendent of schools in my city of Long Beach, a city of some 300,000 people, and also one from the superintendent of the State Polytechnic Institute of San Luis Obispo. I think those famous educators know the importance of the program where there are some 60,000 students affected in my State of California.

Mr. FOGARTY. This comes under the George-Barden Act. The Bureau of the Budget this year recommended that \$10,000,000 be cut out of the \$19,842,760 normally appropriated for that particular fund. They wanted that \$10,000,000 set aside for defense training, which would cut into the agricultural and home economics and mechanical arts and distributive education part of these funds. The committee did not go along with the request of the Bureau of the Budget. We overrode the Bureau of the Budget and put back that \$10,000,000 and kept the funds of the George-Barden Act intact so that these agricultural and mechanical arts and home economics programs would not be disturbed. But it was brought to our attention about the distributive occupations, and we put in the hearings, beginning on page 391, what the so-called distributive occupations are. The committee was unanimous in this, after looking at the distributive occupations classes being taught, such as training gas-station attendants and soda-fountain people, and elevator operators and salesmen in the stores. There are a vast number of them in this list, such as parliamentary procedures, merchant-association management, analyzing distribution costs, public relations training, principles of retailing, economics of retailing, business clinics, show-card writing, marketing research, retail display, direct mail advertising, psychology of selling, English and speech for sales purposes and personality development.

Well, when we got into those things we thought in times like these we should retrench a little bit, and we only cut off \$1,794,000 plus. We felt, all things considered, that nobody would be hurt if we cut out this \$1,794,000.

Mr. DOYLE. Granting the desirability of reducing Federal expense, I think the chairman has not yet enumerated from pages 391, 392, and 393 of the hearings the objects of education which do seem to me to be reasonable, such, for instance, as instructions in the problems of small business and several others which cannot be called less than always important.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is not much of that in this particular store education thing. If you will read that list, you will see reference to classes in Spanish for salespeople, cashier and checker training, Portuguese for salespeople, French for salespeople, Italian for salespeople, store system training, receptionist training, elevator operator training, routemen training, tourist information and courtesy—I am reading right down the list. That is the type of distributive education classes they are conducting.

We realize some of it is desirable, but not sufficiently important at this time when we must husband our limited dollars.

Mr. DOYLE. Manifestly some of those items may be very desirable, probably some are not in view of necessity of reducing Federal expenditures. I read the telegrams:

LONG BEACH, CALIF., April 16, 1951.
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress, House Office Building,
Washington:

Knowing your interest in education following is sent as a guide. Labor Federal security appropriation bill to be voted upon Tuesday, April 17. Bill omits inclusion of distributive education. Douglas Newcomb, school superintendent, Long Beach Sales Executive Club and Retailers Associated urge reinstatement of distributive education as training field continued through past world war merchants prices fixed. Losing experienced salesmen to war plants. Decreased efficiency increases cost prices and damages public morale. Trained replacements needed. Federal money matched by State.

J. E. HOLLINSWORTH.

SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIF., April 16, 1951.
Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives:

Just learned that \$10,000,000 was restored to the budget bill for vocational education but \$1,500,000 was deducted for the purpose of abolishing distributive education program. Understand appropriation bill will be heard on the floor of the House of Representatives Tuesday, April 17. By abolishing this valuable program at this time it will deprive 129 school departments and 60,000 students of the training and distributive education. Hope you can do something on behalf this fine program.

JULIAN A. MCPHEE,
President, California State Polytechnic
College, San Luis Obispo, Calif.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Continuing, the list shows interior decorating, selling home furnishings, hardware selling, "paint power" training, building material selling, wallpaper selling, estimating heating and air conditioning, blueprint reading for salesmen, shoe selling, men's wear selling, fur selling, soda-fountain training, cosmetic selling, drug-store management, variety-store selling.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am interested in this elimination of the distributive vocational training. It seems to me many of those things the gentleman read are just as important as a man's learning a manual trade. Take an individual who wants to take a course in retail selling and learn Spanish for use in the Spanish-American sections of our Nation, such as Texas and California. I think it is a legitimate means of training him so that he can have a livelihood. It seems that some of those individual items the gentleman read may not be worthy, but it does seem that some of them are, particularly in the field of retail selling, because it is in those fields that the individuals have to make a living, the same as in the fields where they use manual training as pro-

vided in the George-Barden Act, agriculture, home economics, and the trade and industry sections of it.

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with the gentleman that if we were not faced with a drive for economy in this country and we had a lot of money to spend, some of those things are desirable, but I think the gentleman understands that we spent several weeks on this bill, and we tried to cut where it would hurt the least. This is one of the places. There are many, many other places we have cut much more deeply than this on projects in which I am personally interested. There are many things I should like to see increased, but we have not increased one single item. We have cut practically every item. I think the gentleman will agree with me that no one will be hurt by this.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I think the gentleman and his committee have done a fine job on this. I want to compliment them particularly on removing the clause in the former legislation which prohibited \$10,000,000 of the George-Barden fund from being used in anything except defense training, because that has disrupted the educational system in many parts of the Nation. In California we have about 129 communities that are dependent on those funds to help pay the salaries of teachers. I defer to the judgment of the gentleman and his committee on this particular point.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. The gentleman from Iowa made an important point, I think, but as I understand the general legislation under which this appropriation is made, the criteria were adequate. In other words, no district can qualify unless it is shown that it is maintaining the same ratio, the same contribution, and unless there is real distress there. It seems to me the experience on this thing would be very helpful. In other words, if we need to make improvements in the formula by which the money is made available to the impacted district, then of course experience will point the way.

It seems to me the committee has done the right thing in granting the full request, because my information is that really much more is actually needed than has actually been made available under the appropriation.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice on page 15, under the "Grants for school construction" that in line 17, after setting forth that \$75,000,000 is to remain available for school construction, it is provided that no portion of this appropriation shall be available for reimbursement payments under section 205. Would the gentleman explain that, and tell us what the effect of that provision is and what it refers to?

Mr. FOGARTY. Because of the urgency of other projects whose applications had been approved and the limited amount of money that they had to work

with, they had to make out these priority lists to take care of the most urgent situations that they were faced with at the time. Actually, the law itself requires that where there is not enough money available, preference must be given to new projects as contrasted to reimbursements for projects heretofore built.

Mr. DONDERO. This bill carries out the policy of assisting school districts in impacted areas where they absolutely cannot take care of the situation alone?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. Is it not a fact that most of this distributive training program was set up primarily in connection with the veterans training program and with the veterans apprenticeship program in the first place?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. This was set up several years ago by legislation. I cannot recall how many years ago, but it goes way back. It is something that has been going on for years.

Mr. BROWNSON. As a small-business man who learned his distributive training at \$8 a week in a retail store, I congratulate the committee on its decision.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. As I understand, this cuts out all of the distributive education?

Mr. FOGARTY. It does.

Mr. HAMILTON C. JONES. My district is in the neighborhood of Charlotte, and we have operated out of Charlotte under this program. There are two schools in the county and six in my home county. I know that they are teaching courses which are of great value to the students. Of course this cripples the whole program and will practically knock it out. So I hope that there will be enough funds retained to keep those programs handling worth-while vocations and not the trash and such things as the gentleman read a few minutes ago.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I intended to read what we have put in the RECORD on these three pages as to just what distributive education means and the number of young people taking these courses and everything else. It gives a pretty complete breakdown. I was not just reading isolated examples. However, I can agree with the gentleman that it is going to cripple that particular program to the extent it depends on Federal funds. But this is one place where we thought we could cut and do little or no real harm. However, the gentleman will have an opportunity when the bill is being read for amendment to offer any amendment he may think is desirable.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am certainly very disappointed that this item has been cut. In my State, I do not know of any money that has done more good for the people than this item which the committee has cut out providing for the training of these boys. I certainly hope the item will be restored. I think this training program is one of the most outstanding things that we in the Congress have done for the young people of this country to enable them to get the training which they need.

Mr. FOGARTY. We were faced with a problem. The Bureau of the Budget recommended taking \$10,000,000 out of the George-Barden Act for defense training, which would have disrupted, as we believed and as outside witnesses and other Members of the Congress believed, the most important functions of that act and those were the functions in agriculture, in the mechanical arts, and home economics. Those were the three principal functions of the four. We thought we were doing a good job by keeping the most essential parts of the act intact; that is, the training for agriculture, mechanical arts, and home economics. We felt that distributive education would be the one place we could show some savings and not do any real harm. We overrode the Bureau of the Budget and we went all the way down the line on agriculture, mechanical arts, and home economics, because we were convinced by the testimony of other Members of Congress and people who came from other States throughout the country, and our own knowledge, that those were most necessary and should not be cut.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I hope the gentleman will join us in voting for an amendment to restore this amount.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am sorry I will not be able to do that, as much as I would like to.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken much more time than I anticipated when I began. I have tried to give a general picture of the committee recommendations.

We will continue debate today as long as anyone desires to speak. In my own way I have tried to tell you what we were up against in cutting this particular appropriation bill, and how we were held down by existing legislation in trying to cut some of the appropriations.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact, in answer to the question by the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], who is most zealous at all times in keeping down expenses, as to the number of personnel that had been cut in the Labor Department. I now have the figures for him. Information available indicates that we have eliminated approximately 55 positions under the estimates of the budget. And compared with 1951, there would be approximately 670 less positions. I think that is the information that the gentleman from Kansas inquired about earlier this afternoon.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman. It is the information I was seeking. Together with that I wanted to make sure that the cost of that employment had not been shifted to the Defense Department or some other agency. It is a real reduction in employment?

Mr. McGRATH. I can assure the gentleman that it is, based on estimates supplied to us.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island has consumed 50 minutes.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct pleasure to be able to say a few words complimentary of the chairman of this committee and the majority members of the committee as well as in behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

In the first place, during my entire service on the Appropriations Committee and on this subcommittee in former years and on other subcommittees, there never has been more harmonious work done by any subcommittee of which I have been a member. That is due to the fact that every member of the committee had in mind a single purpose. That was to appropriate all the money that was necessary for the legitimate operation of the various agencies for which we were called upon to make appropriations, without crippling them to any considerable extent and prohibiting their functioning. And at the same time, to bear in mind, as we heard from every witness, the necessity of appropriating economically; of appropriating only for the purposes that were really necessary for nondefense activities.

The witnesses from the agencies came in and almost without exception the heads of those agencies tried to key all of their activities to defense operations. That was a very difficult problem for us to face. They would say that this particular program was necessary to the defense program, and that this other program was essential in order that we might have a proper and efficient defense program, and that we must appropriate more money here than was appropriated before; that the activities must be extended and more money spent to the extent the chairman has just pointed out. In one instance the President's Bureau of the Budget had asked for a diversion of some \$10,000,000 from this national education program to defense activities, and in another instance about a similar amount. So we were confronted with those things from the very beginning. We had to do what we thought was the best we could do under the circumstances by separating those things which were not absolutely essential for the defense program and were logically in the class of nondefense essentials and appropriating in those instances economically. I think the chairman told you very ably what our general program was; and I want to say that while we were conducting these

hearings the chairman gave every member of the committee, minority as well as majority member, every opportunity to interrogate any witness or to bring any witness before the committee they wanted to interrogate, and no one was cut off. So I want to congratulate the chairman for being extremely liberal and reasonable.

Then we came to marking up the bill, and the chairman with the members of the committee present led in the reading of the items. I want to admit frankly that being economically-minded, as I am, I thought that perhaps we should have made deeper cuts in many instances than we did.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Because of my sincere friendship for the gentleman from Oklahoma and knowing his great desire for economy in this particular bill I went further than I ordinarily would have gone because of his influence on me during the marking up of the bill.

Mr. SCHWABE. I think there is no doubt about that, and I want to thank the gentleman publicly for acceding to my request in many instances. He was very generous and very considerate, and I appreciate it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield gladly.

Mr. HINSHAW. I received a communication from the educational authorities of my district concerning an item called Distributive Education with a statement on their part that that item had been completely deleted from the bill. I am not quite certain that I fully understand what the term "Distributive Education" means. I would like to hear the gentleman's comments on it.

Mr. SCHWABE. May I say to the gentleman from California that had he been on the floor a few moments earlier the chairman of the committee addressed himself to the same subject in answer to a question from two other Members from California, and I believe he would have had a full explanation.

Mr. HINSHAW. I regret that it was not possible for me to be on the floor at that time.

Mr. SCHWABE. I appreciate that and there is no criticism, and I shall repeat some of it for the benefit of my friend.

In the first place, the appropriation for this particular item now known as the George-Barden Act has been rather stable for many years. The Bureau of the Budget has requested that some \$10,000,000 or \$11,000,000 of this be subject to the defense activities as might be directed. That would have disrupted; yes, it would have destroyed as we were told by the most competent witnesses we could get, all of the effective work under the George-Barden Act on vocational education. The George-Barden Act provides for vocational education along the lines of agriculture and domestic science, and they have other items called the distributive program of education, and that is what we cut out. To answer the gentleman, we have eliminated that. We have in the hearings

to which the chairman referred a few moments ago some two or three pages listing the items that fall within the distributive education field such as training people to be grocery clerks, salesmen in every line and learning different languages for salesmanship and approach and contact work, filling-station attendants, soda jerkers, and what-not, almost everything conceivable that I could think of. In fact, I had no idea there was such a list of activities included within the general scope that has just been mentioned. But we have preserved the main items of the bill and of the program under the George-Barden Act and, so far as I know, with the general approval of the best minds who have helped us consider this bill.

We felt we could not appropriate fully the items recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and we felt more definitely certain, unanimously so, that we could not leave it to the Defense Department to take ten or eleven million dollars away from this item and absolutely destroy the field of vocational education activities under the George-Barden Act. If the gentleman will take a few minutes to read those three or four pages of the hearings he will see there is a list of items there that ordinarily the States and localities can and will take care of, if they want to consider that minor part of the activity under the George-Barden Act.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thank the gentleman. Can he refer me to the page numbers in the hearings?

Mr. McGRATH. Three hundred and ninety-one and 392, and it includes such things as tombstone selling.

Mr. SCHWABE. That is one of a multiplicity of items, but the pages are 391, 392, and 393.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. Is there anything in this program that is considered worthwhile?

Mr. SCHWABE. There is no doubt but what there is some good in the worst programs and I think that is true here; but, by and large, the program was not considered of such importance as other programs under the George-Barden Act, which is the reason we eliminated that feature of it. We thought that was of the least importance.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have here copy of Public Law 586 of the Seventy-ninth Congress in which it was stated that—

Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a), the amount to be available for expenditure in any State or Territory shall be not less, for any fiscal year, than \$40,000 each for vocational education in agriculture, in home economics, and in trades and industry; \$15,000 for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Is there any conflict between what the committee has done and the basic law which says there must be \$15,000 of any appropriation under this Act assigned in each State to distributive occupations?

Mr. SCHWABE. We simply have not appropriated any amount for distributive education.

Mr. McCARTHY. That would appear to be contrary to the provisions of the public law passed by the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. SCHWABE. Perhaps so, but we have not appropriated for it as we legally are not bound under any penalty to appropriate for any item under any authorization bill unless the Appropriations Committee, approved by the Congress, sees fit to do so.

Mr. McCARTHY. But \$15,000 of every \$40,000, it was provided, must go to distributive education. Now, two Congresses later we say this program is of such nature we will not provide anything.

Mr. SCHWABE. We have limited the dollars to be appropriated for this item.

I want to add that the other members of this committee join the chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK], the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] in saying that the minority members were shown every possible courtesy, and on behalf of the minority members we want to thank them and to say also that the very able clerk of this committee, Paul Wilson, was as fair to one side as to the other, as far as we could tell—we have always known him to be that way—and likewise his assistant. So it was a pleasure to work with and have the cooperation of my worthy chairman in acceding to many of my requests for cuts, as he has so kindly condescended to say this afternoon, resulting, in what he has told you, in an over-all cut of \$89,973,799 as compared with the estimates of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, may I just suggest that in connection with appropriation bills and subcommittees on which I served in the past I do not think there have been any instances until now but what I received a number of wires and letters and telephone and personal calls from many people expressing dissatisfaction with the figures. These figures were published about a week ago, or almost a week ago, at any rate, and so far I have received only one such protest. I will get others, perhaps, but they have not come in in any great number, which indicates to me that the cuts we have made are justified. Perhaps we could have done a better job and gone even lower, and I believe we could have, but the committee worked this program out the best we thought we could in perfect harmony and with unanimity. I think that we all agreed under all the circumstances this is about the best we could do upon the evidence that was presented before the committee. I just say frankly that I hope the Committee of the Whole will sustain the work of our committee because we tried hard to do a good job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

[Mr. STEFAN addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix of today's RECORD.]

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] such time as he may desire.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to inquire of the chairman of the committee about the item in this bill for school construction under the Federal impact legislation that was passed last year. As I understand it, this bill contains an appropriation in the amount of \$75,000,000, and a supplemental request for \$50,000,000 has already been made by the Bureau of the Budget. As I further understand it, the full amount of the budget request is contained in the bill, but I am advised by the Office of Education that, should the entire amount be appropriated, there would still be many approved projects not provided for by any appropriation now under consideration. If that is true the effect is going to be that certain schools are going to be able to go on with their construction programs while other schools will have to await further action by the Congress. So, we are going to have a discriminatory situation which is going to be unfair to some school districts.

I would like to ask the chairman whether that statement is substantially correct and if so whether or not the committee would agree to increase this item to an amount sufficient to take care of all approved projects.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the committee was not in possession of all the facts, of course. In the first place, we do not know whether the communities where these schools are going to be built will get building priority materials to build them with. That is an unknown quantity. We do not know whether they are going to be available or not. At the same time, some communities have built schools, and under the law they could expect to be reimbursed for some portion of the cost. That was before the national emergency we are in at the present time had hit its peak. Only this much money has been available. A lot of it has been guess work in the past. It is something that is coming to a head now. They have appealed to the Bureau of the Budget. As I said before, they have asked for \$100,000,000 additional money. The Bureau of the Budget allowed them only \$50,000,000 of that \$100,000,000, why I do not know, because that request has gone over to the Senate. But under the facts as we had them, we went along and gave them everything the Bureau of the Budget allowed, and that is all a Government agency could request from the committee.

Mr. ALBERT. Did the Office of Education suggest to the gentleman's committee that the Bureau of the Budget cut was not justified in view of the approved applications which the Office of Education has on hand?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. We have not had any testimony on that, because that is something that developed after these hearings were held. We have no control over that last request. The request of the Bureau of the Budget has gone to the Senate, because they are holding hearings on this particular bill at the present time in the Senate. I think

the best thing to do would be to make the request over there, because they have it before them. It is a live problem with them, whereas we have gone through it ourselves.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I am reluctant to offer any criticism at all of this report. The committee has been very conscientious, as its personnel would be with any assignment. I appreciate the courteous hearing they have given those of us who have some complaints because of cuts in items.

I rise particularly to speak of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. There is a cut for the Bureau of Labor Statistics of almost \$1,000,000—\$950,000. I fear that unless we maintain the work of this Bureau the Government will suffer greatly for lack of the valuable statistics which only this agency can supply.

For about 25 years the Bureau has been providing statistics for the public and for Government agencies. I think it would be uniformly agreed that they have done a scientific job. They have never been partisan. They have maintained the highest professional standards. Incidentally, its name is somewhat misleading. It might logically be called the Bureau of Statistics. It is in the Department of Labor, but it is serving not only labor groups but many economic interests.

I call attention to this tremendous cut which I think is attributable chiefly to the fact that the committee concluded construction statistics could be dispensed with. I regret the action very much. I do not propose to offer an amendment to restore the amount indicated. I offer this statement in the hope that some way will be found to save the function of compiling the extremely important figures on construction.

I wish to call attention also to the fact that in 1947 the appropriation for the Bureau resulted in a 50-percent reduction in the personnel. It operates today with several hundred fewer employees than during the war.

There is no other agency to provide the figures on the construction industry in this country except the Bureau of Labor Statistics. We are now building new buildings, commercial and residential, at the rate of \$28,000,000,000 a year. That was the figure for the calendar year. The Federal Reserve Board has put into operation, as the House knows, regulation X. How does regulation X operate and how is it affecting the construction industry. The Board will not know unless it has the statistics and there will be no statistics available except as the Bureau of Labor Statistics supplies them. This reduction, of course, deprives them of the personnel they have to have to gather the construction statistics.

It seems to me that it is not wise. Here is a business which is among the top businesses of the country, perhaps the very top single industry in the amount of money involved, \$28,000,000,000. Yet we will not appropriate \$500,000 to supply the Federal Reserve Board with the information it needs to determine the effect of regulation X and the information which other agencies require. It is just as if we had a \$50,000 enterprise and refused to spend \$1 for information as to its cause and effect. For that it is what it is. It amounts to \$500,000 out of a total expenditure in the country for building of \$28,000,000,000. For that reason I hope that in some way this can be corrected and that the Congress will make some provision to carry on the gathering and dissemination of statistics on the construction industry.

There was constructed in the first quarter of this year 250,000 residential units, disapproving incidentally the conclusion of the committee that the volume is being greatly reduced. What will we have the rest of the year? Will there be a million or will it be cut in two? The Federal Reserve Board will not know if this work is cut out entirely. So, for 25 years we have had this excellent work going on. I fear for it unless some provision is made to gather the statistics officially.

I do crave the sympathetic hearing of the committee members when requests are made, and I hope if some way can be found to avoid the impact of such a drastic cut, such measures will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE].

(Mr. DEANE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Chairman, I take the same position as the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] in not offering an amendment involving the appropriation for vocational rehabilitation. But I do take this time to get in the RECORD the fact that the States are carrying on a remarkable program of rehabilitation. As I walked into the Chamber a few minutes ago there was in the outside corridor a wonderful lad from Korea—an amputee. I am thinking of that great host of American citizens who are not veterans but who are subject to the rehabilitation program of our various States.

The basic civilian rehabilitation law, Public Law 113, obligates the Federal Government to pay all administration, guidance, and placement cost and to match on a dollar-for-dollar basis State funds for case services, that is, money actually spent on the clients; hospitalization, surgery, training, and so forth.

The 1951 appropriation is \$20,600,000. In their budgets for 1952, based upon State funds expected to be available, the States indicated a need for over \$25,000,000 of Federal funds. The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$23,000,000. The House committee has reported the Labor-FSA bill with \$20,475,000 for vo-

cational rehabilitation, \$125,000 less than the 1951 appropriation and \$2,575,000 less than recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. From estimates furnished, the States will have available in 1952 two and one-half million more than in 1951. The increase recommended by the Bureau was to match this money for case services and did not include any increase for salaries, travel, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, let me raise the question. Is it wise to stint funds for vocational rehabilitation, which reduces dependency and makes taxpayers out of tax consumers. In fact, it has been proven that rehabilitated persons repay during an average life expectancy in Federal income taxes alone 10 times what is spent on them. At this particular time it is especially shortsighted to cut back rehabilitation, which, in light of increased cost, will actually result from appropriation of only \$20,475,000 for 1952.

In the first place, rehabilitation is a defense related activity, making a valuable contribution to manpower resources at a time when the Nation is straining every nerve to provide manpower for military and civilian needs. Sixty thousand persons were rehabilitated into employment last year, and this number can be substantially increased with sufficient funds. The difference between the \$20,475,000 in the House bill and the \$23,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget would mean between 5,000 to 10,000 more rehabilitations.

Again, vocational rehabilitation reduces dependency and is a pressure against rising public assistance cost. This is more important than ever, now that a public assistance category for the totally and permanently disabled has been established by Congress. State welfare administrators admit that persons are being put on public assistance rolls who could be rehabilitated, if State rehabilitation agencies had the money to do the job.

The Labor-FSA appropriation bill includes \$79,000,000 for public assistance for the totally and permanently disabled and only \$20,475,000 for rehabilitation. We do not question the need for public assistance for some of the disabled, but it does look to us like Congress should see that rehabilitation programs are given an opportunity to reduce the number needing such assistance as much as possible.

The average cost of rehabilitating a person is \$492 and nonrecurring. The average annual cost of public assistance is much more and goes on year after year. Congress should decide, and decide now, whether to appropriate endless millions for pensions for the handicapped or provide the funds needed to rehabilitate them. The following instances will illustrate the difference in dollars and cents to the taxpayer. One State, Delaware, made a study of 36 persons removed from the public assistance rolls by rehabilitation. The 36 were drawing \$30,186 annually from public assistance. These people were rehabilitated at a cost, including administration, of \$12,724. The first year after rehabilitation, the 36 earned \$60,948.

I am advised by officials from the States that rather serious administrative problems also are presented if the Budget Bureau's figure is not appropriated by Congress for 1952. The States are doing their part and are appropriating \$2,500,000 more funds for 1952. If such funds for case services are matched, States getting no increases for 1952 will have Federal funds cut. If States receiving no increase in their own funds are not cut, then States with additional State funds cannot get them matched by Federal funds as required by law. In either case, the program is going to suffer badly.

My own State, North Carolina, has a very effective rehabilitation program, both for blind and nonblind; 2,867 handicapped persons were rehabilitated last year. Our State legislature has just appropriated slightly over \$1,000,000 to carry on this work for the next biennium, an increase of nearly \$200,000 over the present biennium. If this is not matched by Federal funds, services are going to be denied many worthy, handicapped persons. What is true of North Carolina is also true of many other States.

I am advised that every dollar is to be used to match funds appropriated by the States for services directly to crippled people.

The question I would like to address to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who has labored so faithfully for this program, is if he feels that the Federal Government on the reduced appropriations will be in a position to match dollar for dollar the appropriations that are going to be put up by various States as previously indicated?

Mr. FOGARTY. As the gentleman knows, I have always been a supporter of this particular program. I do not believe there is a better program in the Federal Government because we have been told year after year that for every dollar we appropriate the Federal Treasury receives \$10 in return in taxes and in getting people off of the relief rolls and such things. This year they wanted an increase of \$2,525,000 over what they had available in 1951. In view of the economic situation, we have cut practically every item in this appropriation bill. Even though that is one that I did not like to go along with, I went along because of the situation in which we find ourselves. But the \$125,000, about which the gentleman spoke, was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. That was not something that this committee did. We accepted the Bureau's recommendation on that cut, and that is the reason it is in there.

Mr. DEANE. I am grateful to the chairman of the committee for the position he takes in support of this program. I think we should take a long-range view of this whole subject. After all, our objective should be to prevent these unfortunate people from going on public assistance unnecessarily. We must continue and enlarge this program of rehabilitation instead of forcing them on the relief rolls. I trust that as we speed up the Federal angle of rehabilitation we will keep in mind what the various States are trying to do. If we slap them down 1 year, the chances are that the

program may become seriously handicapped.

I wish to say again that I appreciate the interest of the subcommittee in this subject, and as they enter conference I trust that more accurate matching figures will be available from the various States to the end that no State will be penalized, which I fear if the present appropriation is allowed to stand. Finally, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I trust the conference committee will come within approximate matching distance with the various States.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK].

(Mr. HEDRICK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

ORIGIN OF OUR PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Chairman, our public health service had its beginning in 1798, as a program for the hospital and medical care of American Merchant Seamen. On display in the office of the Surgeon General, Public Health Service, is a facsimile of the original act, signed by President John Adams. Congress during the past 80 years, has imposed many additional duties and responsibilities on the service. Today, the Public Health Service is carrying out these responsibilities under the present basic law, the Public Health Service Act of July 1, 1944, Public Law 410, Seventy-eighth Congress. It also administers the water Pollution Control Act, Public Law 845, Eightieth Congress, passed in 1948.

Thus, the Congress has authorized the Public Health Service to conduct many programs and provide services which contribute to the health of the American people. Some authorizations are broad in scope, while others are specific. Research and investigations, control of communicable diseases, and cooperation with the States, are in the broad categories; specific categories cover medical and hospital care of legal beneficiaries, foreign and interstate quarantine, medical examination of aliens, the regulation of biologic products, control of venereal diseases and tuberculosis, construction of hospitals and health centers, and the control of water pollution. Also, there are specific programs of research in the following fields: microbiology—that is, bacteriology—cancer, heart diseases, dental diseases, mental illnesses, arthritis, and metabolic diseases, neurological diseases and blindness. Some of these programs are the direct operations of the Public Health Service, and others are combinations of direct operations and grants. In addition, the service also has grant programs.

IMPORTANCE OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Today, and in the future, the Public Health Service is important. In every respect, the programs of the Public Health Service are concerned with saving the Nation's manpower, the basic objective being to reduce the volume of

preventable deaths and disabling illness—the greatest drains upon our capacity to produce.

ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCALITIES IN DISEASE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

States and localities are assisted by the Public Health Service in the prevention and control of communicable diseases, and advised on other matters pertaining to the preservation and improvement of public health.

HOSPITAL BUILDING PROGRAM

The Public Health Service also provides aid to the States and communities with the national hospital survey and construction program—a vital health service. The Congress established this program in 1946 under the Hill-Burton Act, amending the Public Health Service Act of 1944, in recognition of the great need throughout the Nation for hospitals and health centers. Since 1948 almost 1,500 projects have been approved for Federal construction grants, of which 382 have been completed. These hospitals and health centers are integral parts of the Nation's total health resources—essential to conserving our manpower for industry, farming, and the Armed Forces. These facilities will also greatly strengthen our abilities to cope with atomic or biological warfare as nearly all are located outside probable target areas.

NATIONAL EMERGENCY NEEDS

The national emergency intensifies the necessity for continuation and expansion of the activities of the Public Health Service in the field of medical research, as well as in public health. Research accomplishments of the service have been very beneficial in such times. As an example, before World War II, research workers at the national institutes of health developed a vaccine to prevent typhus fever. This vaccine was markedly improved during the early days of the war. Our troops were thus protected against typhus fever, and our troops today are protected by the same vaccine. It is not possible to determine what this contribution will mean to our forces in the Korean action.

A research team of the Public Health Service discovered that a solution of table salt and baking soda in water, taken by mouth, will prevent shock and death in a high proportion of patients with severe burns and injuries. Use of this simple, readily available method will save thousands of lives that would otherwise be lost, in the event of enemy attack. None of us can doubt the value of this research.

In World War I, some of the so-called childhood communicable diseases were among the major problems in the communicable disease field in our Army. Some of these diseases were not so serious in World War II. When you bring boys in from the farm, you find many who have not been exposed to such diseases. Mumps is an example of a very serious disease in adult males, and it can be almost as serious a disease in the adult female, although not quite as much.

HOSPITAL LOCATIONS

Because the largest groups of beneficiaries are seamen of the Merchant Marine and Coast Guard men, the Marine hospitals are located principally along the seacoast, the Great Lakes, and the Mississippi River. The Public Health Service also operates a tuberculosis hospital in New Mexico, the national hospital for patients with Hansen's disease at Carville, La., and two hospitals for the treatment and custody of narcotic addicts at Fort Worth, Texas, and Lexington, Ky.

QUARANTINE SERVICES

Our national laws for the exclusion of epidemic diseases and international sanitary codes, to which country is signatory, require the maintenance of quarantine services at seaports and airports of entry, as well as at border stations.

The control of biologic products insures the potency and purity of vaccines, serums, and similar medical supplies. The Public Health Service licenses the manufacture and importation of such products.

VITAL STATISTICS

The National Office of Vital Statistics of the Public Health Service compiles, analyzes, and reports the Nation's figures on births, deaths, sickness, marriage, and other basic population data. This national fact-finding activity is most important. As an example, the Department of Defense and the Selective Service System depend on national vital statistics for estimates of the numbers of men who will be available in each age group for each year. School officials, other governmental agencies, and many industries depend on such data for planning their program. In the event of an enemy attack with biological weapons, whether by sabotage or military operations, the Nation's ability to combat an introduced disease will depend in large part on the readiness of the States and the National Office of Vital Statistics to act promptly in detecting and reporting cases and deaths.

PARTICIPATION IN OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The Public Health Service participates in many Federal programs outside the Federal Security Agency. It staffs the medical and dental program of the Coast Guard and cares for its personnel in Public Health Service hospitals and out-patient clinics. It operates the medical service in the Federal prisons. The National Security Resources Board and the Federal Civil Defense Administration call upon the Public Health Service for technical service, including the assignment of specialists and the conduct of special studies. Currently, Public Health Service personnel are assisting in at least 40 other Federal activities, as full-time or part-time consultants, or as members of special committees. As an example, there are Public Health Service consultants with the Atomic Energy Commission and with the Defense Department's Committee on Special Weapons.

BACTERIAL AND CHEMICAL WARFARE

With regard to bacterial and chemical warfare, the range of known bacteria

which can be used is quite extensive. It can be spreading typhoid fever by contaminating our public water supplies, either at the source or at the reservoir, or by contaminating a public water supply at some important point along the line. To illustrate, to attack the Congress, one might find a major water main coming into the Capitol or into one of the office buildings, and at that point put the material in. If the chlorine reserve in the water at that point were very low, and it would be under current practices in the United States, then everybody who had some of that water would get some typhoid bacilli and under certain circumstances, might develop typhoid fever.

RESEARCH

The original research arm of the Public Health Service was the National Institutes of Health. It is still the primary research arm in the field of the biological sciences, and particularly in the field of fundamental research as contrasted with applied research. Earliest work of the National Institutes of Health was in the field of bacteriology. This was in the era of bacteriology when there was a national interest, a Federal interest, in diseases which one man could spread to another. Thoughts of cooperation, thoughts of international cooperation on quarantine, thoughts of cooperation between the Federal Government and the States, were the general thought of that time. The program began largely in that way. There was the thought that there might be some germ theory of cancer. Also, there was interest in nutrition and in a few other areas. Congress, then, in 1947, passed unanimously the National Cancer Institute Act, believing, apparently, that the cancer problem, then killing 125,000 or 130,000 people a year, was of sufficient importance to warrant a directed large-scale national attack on it through Federal action.

It is a pleasure for me to call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the many functions the Public Health Service renders to our people. I wish to congratulate Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General, Public Health Service, for the excellent work being done by this Service. I believe he deserves a great deal of credit for the accomplishments of this department. The appropriation asked for the Public Health Service, \$339,364,000, is, I believe, very reasonable, and I feel that it will be money well spent. The committee has done an excellent job. There has been full cooperation of all the members at all times. No dissatisfaction or criticism from any member has materialized during the long meetings of this subcommittee. It has been a pleasure to serve with the members of the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the House Appropriations Committee. I hope that there will not be any amendments offered to this bill and that no attempt will be made to cut or increase the appropriation. Due to the national emergency all appropriations should be held down as much as possible.

(Mr. HAYS of Arkansas asked and was given permission to extend his remarks which he made in Committee of the Whole.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read down to and including page 1, line 7.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. Hays of Arkansas having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3709, had come to no resolution thereon.

TIME OF JOINT MEETING ON THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYS of Arkansas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that as the result of information received in connection with the joint meeting which will take place on Thursday next as a result of the invitation extended to General MacArthur, the joint meeting will take place at 12:30 p. m.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TACKETT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS SOCIALISM

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, I have personally invited the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to be present this afternoon to hear personally the remarks that I have to make.

During my statement to the Whole House on the State of the Union, Tuesday, April 10, 1951, as reported at pages 3688 and 3689 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] asked two questions of me; the first question being, "Does the gentleman think that the people of Ontario are Communists?" and the second question being, "Does the gentleman know that the people of the State of Arkansas are overcharged 100 percent for their electricity?" That is every single, solitary word that was uttered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Now, the RECORD reflects quite a few remarks by the gentleman following his two questions; however, the extension of his remarks merely serves to refute his contentions that private enterprise should be federalized.

ECONOMIC PRINCIPLES OF COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM ARE SYNONYMOUS

The first of the two questions asked of me by the gentleman from Mississippi, "Does the gentleman think the people of Ontario are Communists?" was simply answered by my statement that I did

not know; and I might add here that there is no difference in their economic principles and those of communism.

In the extension of his remarks, he states that the people of Ontario are the most conservative people in America; that they have a fine public power system; and that the people in this country would save \$2,000,000,000 a year on their light and power bills if we would adopt the principles and philosophies of Ontario. Of course, the \$2,000,000,000 figure was grabbed out of the air with no basis for same other than his own word of mouth. He could have more accurately stated that the people of Ontario are subjects of Canada and make up a portion of the socialistic British Empire.

I would be happy for the gentleman to compare the general welfare, educational opportunities, economic stability, and domestic progress of the people of Ontario or any other portion of the socialistic British Empire with that of the citizenship in any section of the United States.

Russia and her satellites advocate and practice communism. England and her dominions advocate and practice socialism. The economic policies, philosophies and principles of communism and socialism are the same.

OVERCHARGING FOR ELECTRICITY IS A FELONIOUS CRIME

The second of the two questions asked of me by the gentleman from Mississippi, "Does the gentleman know that the people of the State of Arkansas are overcharged 100 percent for their electricity?" was an exaggerated implication that any person buying electricity from any source other than the Federal Government is being doubly overcharged.

If there be any foundation for such an implication, it is the duty and obligation of the gentleman from Mississippi, as a Member of this Congress and as a citizen of this country, to report the facts and figures and divulge the source to an appropriate committee of this Congress and to the Department of Justice, insisting that each and every electrical power company official and employee responsible for falsifying the income, expenditures, and profits of the respective companies to the State utility commissions and the Federal Power Commission be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the State and Federal laws governing strict control of earnings and profits of private utilities.

If there be any basis for such an accusation, the Kefauver and Fulbright investigating committees will have been found napping. Their crime and influence discoveries will not have amounted to a drop in the bucket compared with the income-tax-evading racketeers in the private utility companies who will have been discovered and exposed by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The gentleman is also implying that the State utility commissions and the Federal Power Commission are guilty of dereliction of duty. Surely he knows that the private utilities are only allowed a 6 percent profit; that they must furnish complete, detailed and itemized accounts

of all expenditures and income to the State utility commissions and the Federal Power Commission; that the utilities can make no improvements or extension of service without the consent and approval of these commissions; and that it is the duty and obligation of the State utility commissions and the Federal Power Commission to carefully investigate, scrutinize, and regulate all books, accounts, and activities of these utilities.

The gentleman does not know any more than I do—and I know nothing—about the cost of producing electricity. He states in the extension of his remarks that his table of figures concerning the alleged cost of electricity and overcharges to the consuming public is compiled by the finest experts in America and is thoroughly reliable. You and I do not know those experts or their qualifications, Mr. Speaker. He never names them—their identity is a secret. Those experts must be pretty old by now because all of us have been seeing the same antiquated table with the same figures in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD year after year, for many years. I guess they have not made any discoveries during the last several years—since the gentleman prepared his table years ago—lowering the cost of producing electricity. The table still cites alleged overcharges on electric rates to the people within TVA-land of Tennessee where there are no private electric power projects; and yet, he contends that any charges of electricity higher than the TVA rule-stick are overcharges. We do not know—none of us—what it costs the Federal Government, through the TVA, to produce electricity.

A typical example of the gentleman's exaggerations is noted in the extension of his remarks wherein he states that it would take a thousand bales of cotton for every county in Arkansas to pay the overcharges for electricity paid by the people of that State every year. This is nearly as wild as his usual phrase when speaking upon any project he favors, "This is the greatest event in medieval or modern times." He does not even consider the event as secondary to the birth of our Saviour.

The gentleman from Mississippi does not only contend that any charges for electricity higher than the Government can produce it is an overcharge to the electricity consumers, but he further contends that the difference in the cost of Government-produced electricity and that produced by private enterprise should be a net savings to the consuming public. I am sure that the overburdened taxpayers of his district would like to know what in the world is going with their tax moneys. He does not calculate the loss of taxes because of the abolition of taxpaying enterprise; he does not take into consideration this loss of taxes being assumed by the other people; he does not consider the economic loss to our citizenship; and he seems to disregard the cost to the taxpayers of constructing, operating, and subsidizing Federal industry. Then, he totally overlooks the loss of freedom of the American people by virtue of a system exact-

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 18, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal God, the creator and source of life and light, we thank Thee for all the beautiful and marvelous revelations and changes which we are witnessing in the world of nature during this glorious spring season.

We pray that these changes may be inner as well as outer experiences, inspiring us to have our lives rooted and grounded in Thy divine life in order that we may grow in moral and spiritual stature, in beauty and strength of character, and in obedience to Thy divine laws.

May the mysteries and splendors of nature, upon which we are looking with wonder and amazement, challenge and stir us with a rebirth of spiritual desires and a renewed spirit of fidelity and devotion to life's loftiest aspirations and noblest principles.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord whom poets and prophets have called the Lily of the Valley, the Rose of Sharon, the Bright and Morning Star. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had returned pursuant to House Resolution 195, the bill H. R. 3587, an act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 271. An act to authorize the transfer to the Vermont Agricultural College of certain lands in Addison County, Vt., for agricultural purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) entitled "An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BYRD, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on

the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51-18.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. After consultation with the majority and the minority leaders of the House and remembering the terrific jam we had upon this floor on previous occasions, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders, the Chair announces that on tomorrow during the ceremony the door immediately opposite the Speaker will be open and the doors on the Speaker's left and right and none other. No one will be allowed upon the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

No one will be allowed in the gallery who does not have a ticket.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 3 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. MEADER asked and was given permission to vacate the special order granted him for tomorrow, and to address the House for 40 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

STUART SYMINGTON

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is to be commended for selecting W. Stuart Symington Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Stuart Symington is an outstanding American. He is not only an intelligent, alert, able person, always working 100 percent in the public interest regardless of the capacity in public or private life in which he is serving. He is also a successful businessman. He has successfully organized, reorganized, built, established, and operated some of the finest and best business concerns in the United States. His ability as a businessman is unquestioned. He is not against big business as such and he is particularly a friend of small and independent business. In Stuart Symington, small-business men, wage earners, small farmers, and consumers generally have an official in one of the most important places in our Government—the head of the RFC—who understands their needs and aspirations.

It is my sincere hope that his confirmation in the other body will receive unanimous approval. I do not know of a man in the United States who is held in higher esteem and who has conducted himself before congressional committees with greater ability, more discretion, and with greater success in the public interest than Stuart Symington.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 32]

Abbitt	Engle	Passman
Allen, La.	Evins	Potter
Bailey	Gillette	Powell
Barden	Gwinn	Riehlman
Boykin	Hall	Rogers, Mass.
Brehm	Leonard W.	Sasser
Buchanan	Hand	Sieminski
Canfield	Hart	Staggers
Cannon	Hébert	Stigler
Carnahan	Kearney	Stockman
Celler	King	Taylor
Chatham	McKinnon	Towe
Cotton	Miller, Nebr.	Vail
Dawson	Miller, N. Y.	Velde
Dingell	Morrison	Wickersham
Donovan	Murdock	Wood, Idaho
Eaton	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff
Elston	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 378 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H. R. 3709, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read the first paragraph of the bill. If there are no amendments to the paragraph, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil-service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; for cooperation with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements relating to the employment of foreign agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$4,635,500, of which \$743,500 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except sec. 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the committee has recommended the reduction of the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service from \$1,583,000 to \$743,500. I am in receipt of a letter from the American Legion, the Disabled American Veterans, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, and the American Veterans of World War II, which I would like to read at this time, relative to this drastic cut. The letter is as follows:

To the Honorable MIKE MANSFIELD,
Member of Congress:

We, the undersigned, representing the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II, wish to strongly protest the report of the Department of Labor-Federal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, which recommends the reduction of the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service from \$1,583,000 to \$743,500. The committee expressed its belief that one Federal veterans' representative and a clerk-stenographer for each State and Territory, together with a small headquarters staff, would be adequate. This action amounts to a cut of over 53 percent, and in money an amount of \$839,500. This constitutes a staggering and crippling blow to an already small but hard-working and sincere Government service agency.

The Veterans' Employment Service is mandated by the people of this Nation and the Congress, under provision of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to cooperate and aid the United States Employment Service and State employment services to the end that veterans shall receive the maximum of job counseling and job opportunity in the field of gainful employment—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The report of the committee shows that the budget estimates

on the Veterans' Reemployment Service of the Labor Department was \$277,000,000, and the amount allowed was \$277,000,000. Therefore, it is rather difficult to understand the communication which the gentleman has received.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say to the gentleman from New York that on the basis of the information I have the budget estimate for the Veterans' Employment Service was \$1,583,000, and it has been reduced to \$743,500.

If the gentleman will allow me to continue with this letter, I will put all the facts on the RECORD.

The letter reads further as follows:

To reduce this splendid, compact, well-organized force of 176 professional field representatives, together with the 8 professional staff members located in Washington, a shell of some 53 field representatives and a correspondingly smaller unit in headquarters would simply render the Veterans' Employment Service incapable of performing the responsibilities and duties mandated to them by law.

Let us point out that there still remains a sizable future task to be accomplished in terms of employment of veterans currently being trained under programs sponsored by the Government. As of February 28, 1951, the Veterans' Administration cites 1,576,484 veterans in educational and training programs under provisions of Public Law 346. On this same date there were 93,604 disabled veterans receiving vocational rehabilitation. The majority of these trainees are potential manpower for defense industry or activities contributing to the defense program. The present conflict in Korea and the increased mobilization of our Armed Forces can only result in a substantial increase in the number of disabled veterans who will require job-finding assistance. By late 1951 and early 1952 the Veterans' Employment Service will probably be faced with a situation which will not differ basically from that of 1945 and 1946. Thousands of servicemen will be discharged from service with combat disabilities and additional thousands with injuries resulting from training and other accidents. It will be the responsibility of the Veterans' Employment Service to facilitate their return to civilian life by finding them suitable employment.

Notwithstanding statistics which indicate that there are 62,000,000 people employed today and the labor market is tightening, the fact remains that there are many communities where employment is spotty. Many areas still have relatively high unemployment. Opportunity to materially reduce unemployment in these areas appears to be small because of geographical location, housing shortage, and inability of large number of workers to migrate. The particular problem as we representatives of the veterans organizations see it is that the Veterans' Employment Service can make a most significant contribution in using its special facilities to gain for the veteran advancement from mediocre jobs to positions which will make full use of the skills he has acquired and the experience he has undergone in training.

The task of rendering special services to veterans in the field of gainful employment remains great. Current operations of and deployment of personnel of the Veterans' Employment Service is servicing efficiently and valuably to the welfare of our fighting men and women upon their discharge from service to their country. We believe that it is absolutely essential that their efforts and continuing positive accomplishments be maintained.

The American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, the Disabled American Veterans, and the American Veterans of World War II at their respective

1950 conventions and encampments mandated full support to the maintenance of the Veterans' Employment Service and its operation of service to veterans in the field of gainful employment. We, therefore, the undersigned, respectfully request that action be taken which will result in the restoration of funds to the full amount as requested by the President in his budget for the fiscal year 1952—\$1,583,000.

MILES D. KENNEDY,

Director, National Legislative Commission, the American Legion.

F. M. SULLIVAN,

Legislative Director, Disabled American Veterans.

OMAR B. KETCHUM,

Director of Legislation, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

CLARENCE G. ADAMY,

National Service Director, American Veterans of World War II.

Mr. Chairman, it is my hope that the Senate will restore this cut, and that the House, in conference, will agree to this. This service, in behalf of our veterans, is most vitally needed and will be in the future.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payments to school district: For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), \$28,000,000.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 15, line 9, strike out the period, insert a colon in lieu thereof and the following: "Provided, That, for the purposes of this appropriation, (1) the local contribution rate computed for any local educational agency under section 3 of such act of September 30, 1950, shall be not less than 80 percent and not more than 120 percent of the national average local contribution rate during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and (2) the current expenditures per child determined for any such agency under section 4 of such act of September 30, 1950, shall be not less than 80 percent and not more than 120 percent of the national average current expenditures per child for the purpose of providing free public education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NORRELL. I would ask the gentleman from Rhode Island to reserve his point of order rather than make it, in order to permit me to make a statement.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my other amendment on page 16, line 3, may be considered at this time, for I am sure the gentleman from Rhode Island will make a point of order against it also on the same grounds. I make this request in order that my remarks may be directed to both amendments at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the second amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 16, line 3, strike out the period, insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "And provided further, That in the case of any application by a local educational agency approved after July 1, 1951, for payment under section 202 of such act, the amount made available by the Commissioner of Education out of this appropriation shall not exceed \$500 times the number of children with respect to whom such agency is entitled to receive payment under such section 202."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this amendment also, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill; and I reserve both points of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to consume the entire 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have consulted with the House Parliamentarian with regard to both these amendments. They deal with the law that we enacted last year regarding the school-aid program in defense areas both as to construction and maintenance.

I admit that my amendments, if adopted, would change the basic law of the land regarding these matters and, therefore, they are subject to points of order; this is legislation on an appropriation bill. But the facts are that since the enactment of this law last year certain weaknesses have arisen which should have the attention of this Congress.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. NORRELL. I yield.

Mr. SCHWABE. I wanted to know if the gentleman's remarks applied to both amendments.

Mr. NORRELL. Yes.

Mr. SCHWABE. Or to only one. Would the last amendment offered by the gentleman be legislation on an appropriation bill or merely a limiting amendment?

Mr. NORRELL. I am advised by the House Parliamentarian that it is legislation, and I believe that is correct. What I say has to do with both amendments. The construction amendment, however, deals with the matter of constructing these school buildings in defense areas. It is estimated that the eventual cost may run to something like \$500,000,000. If my amendment should be adopted it would reduce the Federal contribution in all the schools to a more conservative basis. The one on maintenance is this: It has developed that the Government must give to certain areas where they do not need much, if any, additional aid to schools. It is an enormous and unnecessary expenditure, but it must be made because there is no discretionary authority whatsoever in the Government officials who are enforcing the law. It has developed in other cases

where a larger amount is needed. In certain areas they cannot under existing law get the amount they actually would need.

So my amendment, if adopted, would permit a variation or discretionary scope of not less than 80 or more than 120 percent and would not cost the Government any more money. I admit both amendments are subject to the points of order made, but I make this statement in order to get the matter in the RECORD. I am going to introduce a bill on the subject and I trust that the jurisdictional legislative committee will give it careful consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I admit that both amendments are subject to the points of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE). The Chair sustains the points of order against both amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on page 27 of this bill is an appropriation for St. Elizabeths Hospital. I want to call the attention of my colleagues to the very excellent work being done at St. Elizabeths Hospital and to the fact that in the annual report of this year in relation to religious services provided for the patients the hospital has an unusual record. The superintendent, Dr. Overholser, who some years ago was Commissioner of Mental Diseases in Massachusetts, and a very fine gentleman, an outstanding member of his profession, has cooperated in every way possible with the Catholic priest, Protestant minister, and the Jewish rabbi.

In the annual report covering St. Elizabeths Hospital it is stated:

Regular services have been conducted for Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish patients. These services are well attended, and an effort is made to enable every patient to go whose mental and physical condition permits.

The report also states:

The hospital is fortunate in having a full-time Protestant chaplain and a full-time Catholic chaplain, both of whom are assisted in their duties by seminarians on a volunteer basis.

The report further states:

Jewish services have been held regularly through the Jewish Welfare Board and the Rabbinical Council. The Hebrew Sisters Aid Circle has assisted during the year in the religious services conducted for Jewish patients and in providing entertainment for holidays and distributing refreshments.

Further on the report states:

Both the Protestant and Catholic chaplains renew their urgent plea for a separate interdenominational chapel. The room at present used for chapel in the basement of Hitchcock Hall is wholly inadequate in size to accommodate the number of patients who attend religious services.

The need for a chapel for the hospital has been mentioned in annual reports for a number of years, but partly because the growth of the institution made such pressures for additional buildings the proposal to build a new chapel has not survived the review by the Bureau of the Budget. The request, therefore, has never officially been made to the Con-

gress, and was not submitted this year in the budget estimates.

This hospital has about 8,500 patients. We can therefore realize what an important problem this is.

Furthermore, we all recognize the importance of religion and faith in our individual lives, and certainly that would have particular application to those in hospitals and probably extra emphasis should be laid upon those in mental institutions.

My purpose in rising to address the Committee of the Whole at this time is to have something in the RECORD to show that there is an interest in the near future in having such a chapel authorized and money provided for its construction.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee and the other members of the subcommittee as well as the members of the full Committee on Appropriations, if and when a budget estimate comes up, will give this matter their deep consideration, and I sincerely trust that when a budget estimate does come up in the future it will be favorably acted upon. Knowing the views and the sentiments of my friend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], I am sure that he will agree with that observation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. In the 5 or 6 years that I have been on this committee, we have never had a budget estimate for this particular program, but I think I can assure the gentleman, in agreement with the rest of my subcommittee, that if a budget estimate is submitted to this committee next year it will be given every consideration.

Mr. McCORMACK. I appreciate that very much.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the subject of priorities in the construction program on the civilian level has come before the attention of each and every Member of this House in the form of letters from home from the various school boards and interested officials in the various school-building programs. I have in mind a particular program in my district where the school need is great indeed, yet there is apparently no ability on the part of the school board and the officials in that particular community to obtain the materials that they need.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Is that in the Triple Cities area?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. No; it is a little north of the Triple Cities. There are other parts in my district besides the Triple Cities.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Is the gentleman talking about Public Law 815, the school

construction bill, or some situation which the Government does not have anything to do with at all?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I am talking about the whole construction program on the home front. As the gentleman knows, for the past year there has been great concern on the part of the school officials and various leaders in separate communities over these construction programs. If you will recall, there have been instances in the case of every Member where he has been requested to see Charles Wilson or some other Government official so that we could get some kind of priority of construction material in various civic endeavors back home. It seems to me that while we are in this defense program that we ought to make allowances for the construction of schools and various community buildings so that as these defense programs grow, as workers are moved into one section or another, we will be able to continue with our community system. We do not want it to get the way it is behind the iron curtain where whole communities are uprooted and deprived of the church and the school influence and other beneficial institution that we, as Americans, have been accustomed to.

Mr. PERKINS. I assume that the gentleman from New York is well aware of the fact that the Federal Government only has jurisdiction in cases of this type in federally impacted areas brought about by the military and defense installations that bring about overcrowded conditions of nearby schools.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. School officials in our section want to be sure they are able to obtain building materials. How do we know that the Government will not crack down on them and deprive us of this necessary function?

Mr. PERKINS. From the gentleman's statement, do the schools that he has in mind come within the purview of Public Law 815 or not?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. All I can say to the gentleman is that we have to look ahead all the time. We have to look into the future and see what the possibilities will be, because within the next 6 months or a year or the next 2 years there may be a possibility of widespread cracking down on the procurement of various materials.

Mr. PERKINS. I assume again the gentleman is well aware of the fact that Public Law 815 takes care of impacted construction in impacted areas caused by the loss of revenue by the various school districts by reason of military and other defense installations. May I ask the gentleman if that law is not broad enough to cover the specific instances about which he is talking?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. In the next 6 months there may be a wholesale cracking down by Charles E. Wilson and some of the other high officials on the civilian population. We want to know what it is going to entail.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on page 14, line 3, the bill states:

Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Some questions come to my mind concerning this language. It appears to me this language is rather restrictive and may interfere with some programs which have been put into effect. May I ask some member of the committee if this language will restrict any of the work which is being done in connection with the GI training in distributive occupations?

Mr. FOGARTY. This law has nothing specific to do with the GI training. This appropriation is for distributive education under the George-Barden Act. It does eliminate distributive education under that act for the next fiscal year, insofar as Federal funds are concerned.

Mr. MARSHALL. No funds under the George-Barden Act are presently being used in connection with GI training?

Mr. FOGARTY. This program was established before the GI bill became law—several years before.

Mr. MARSHALL. We have received several wires from retail establishments in the city of St. Paul concerning the programs they have there of training people to work on display and retail advertising, and so forth. That has been done, as I understand, under the George-Barden fund. As I understand this language, it would knock out that particular type of training. Is that correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as the Federal contribution to these schools is concerned, the statement is correct. However, it does not, of course, in any way prohibit the States from carrying on that work with their own funds.

Mr. MARSHALL. I understand, as the chairman must realize, that there are a number of schools that have set those programs into operation expecting the cooperation which they have had in the past with Federal funds.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANHAM. It seems to me it is unfortunate that this language has been written into this bill. Does not the gentleman agree that distribution is just as important in our free-enterprise system as production? In my own State it is going to mean that about 20,000 people who are now getting training will not in the future be able to get it.

Mr. MARSHALL. The language struck me as being unfortunate in the respect that this program has not been in operation any great length of time. I think it was 1947 that the program was inaugurated.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARSHALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BROWNSON. I brought up yesterday a question similar to the gentleman's question, and I checked again last night. In my opinion, where this does

tie in with the GI on-the-job training is that many mercantile establishments have been using courses set up in the high schools and other public schools under the Barden Act to fulfill their obligations for training under the GI on-the-job-training program. That was the reaction they gave me in trying to check up in response to letters such as you have had. In other words, the GI trainees are getting their training, the formal part of it, in public high schools under trade-association programs which are being financed by the Barden Act. So, so far as I can find insofar as that is true, there is somewhat of a tie-in between the GI training and distributive-education training under the Barden Act.

Mr. MARSHALL. It is a little difficult in setting up the departments in the schools to carry on certain types of training to draw the line quite correctly and undoubtedly there are certain programs which receive at least supplementary support. The chairman said it was not the intention of the George-Barden Act to use funds directly for that purpose, however. The elimination of these funds by this restrictive language may seriously affect some of the departments and the very schools where they have been making use of that particular type of program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of my taking the floor now is more to ask the committee a question rather than to make any extended statement. I come from an area where the increase in population has been almost phenomenal. That is the Detroit, Mich., area. Detroit, as everyone knows, is a great center of production of the sinews of war. There was brought into that locality during the last war an immense population. These people have remained there. They did not move away. With the influx of workers and their families came problems which the local school boards could not solve. The result is they have to depend on Federal contributions to help them, if the cause of education is going to be served in that area.

There are several school districts in my congressional district which are vitally affected and where a situation such as I have described exists. From all over southeast Michigan, from my district as well as others, have come appeals from school officials to the effect that the amount provided in this bill is not adequate or sufficient to meet the problem and solve it. I refer to the language on page 15 under "Grants for school construction." You will notice it says grants for emergency school construction, \$75,000,000. I have asked one member of the committee, and I now ask the chairman of the subcommittee, if the evidence submitted to your committee, when you were conducting hearings on this subject, indicated the amount was adequate to meet the problem when

the Committee on Education and Labor reported the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. No, they did not so state it. They stated at the time we held hearings about 2 months ago that they had just submitted to the Bureau of the Budget a request for an additional \$100,000,000 for this fiscal year, 1951, and I have since learned in the last 3 days the Bureau of the Budget has allowed \$50,000,000 of that request. That request has been sent to the other body where they are now holding hearings on this very bill and on the supplemental bill.

Mr. DONDERO. And the indications are that that amount might be added to the \$75,000,000 provided in this bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, I do not want the gentleman to be misled. That is not the \$75,000,000 that you have referred to, which is being appropriated for the next fiscal year. The \$50,000,000 I refer to is a deficiency appropriation for this fiscal year of 1951.

Mr. DONDERO. That is to finish the fiscal year?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. It is my understanding and absolute conviction that should this provision for \$50,000,000 additional—or \$75,000,000—\$25,000,000 of which is for this year, plus the \$50,000,000 supplemental which has been requested, be enacted into law, we will still be short some eighty or eighty-five million dollars of the amount necessary to cover already approved projects.

Mr. DONDERO. And, of course, we anticipate problems arising out of the present emergency program as a further Federal impact on local communities.

Mr. NORRELL. You have a problem which my amendment attempted to correct. In one area of the United States you will have a district that does not need any aid at all. In an area like yours you may need more money than you are getting. The amendment which I offered would simply have given the Department of Education discretionary authority to have used a little variation there from a minimum of not less than 80 percent to a maximum of not more than 120 percent.

Mr. DONDERO. There is a school district in my congressional district where the people have exhausted all possible legal means to provide adequate school facilities, but they cannot meet the needs. This is the only aid to which they can look to solve their educational problems. They even sent their high school students for their physical education to the Detroit House of Correction, a penal institution, because of the lack of space.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman, under Public Law 815, is absolutely correct in his statement. The reason that the Office of Education has not done more toward alleviating the situation that you have described, although Public Law 815 authorizes alleviation of

those conditions, is because of lack of funds. It has been estimated that 697 school districts have made application for Federal assistance for school construction, under section 202 of this law. There are different sections of this law, in my judgment, which fit the situation which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL] has described; namely, sections 202, 203, and 204. If we had adequate funds to implement all of those sections to take care of the Paducah, Ky., situation, and the Savannah River school housing under section 203, it has been estimated it would cost approximately \$380,000,000 to solve this problem amply. The authorization to take care of this situation, with the exception I have noted, we have on the books at the present time.

Mr. DONDERO. Undoubtedly Paducah, Ky., and Livonia Township school district, now the city of Livonia, Wayne County, Mich., in my district are in the same position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, this is a subject that is very dear to my heart, because I spent about 5 months with the Bailey committee seeing this problem in its reality in the South and in the eastern part of our country. What the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] says is positively true. If anything, the situation around Michigan is going to be worse in the next few years than it has been during the last 5 years, because you have a Federal influx in the area on the fringe of Detroit.

I do not know what the representatives of the Department of Education stated in their report to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, but I do know that in my State of Minnesota there are about nine communities that are affected with a Federal impact.

When I made inquiry of the Department, after this appropriation last year, and all of these applications from all over the United States had been filed with the Department, this is the understanding that I got from the Department in the allocation of these funds as prescribed by the yardstick in this bill:

It was a foregone conclusion that they had not nearly enough money to satisfy the eligible or legitimate requests. So as those applications came in, the policy was to make payment on the basis of those in most need—those districts which were most seriously affected, which meant that in the long run there would probably be 200 districts which, by law, were entitled to compensation, either under maintenance and operation or construction, but they would have to wait.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. Certainly.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman and his committee came to our part of Michigan and made a very thorough and

very conscientious investigation. In some of the areas that you visited the population doubled in the 10-year period.

Mr. WIER. And is increasing today.

Mr. HARRISON. Is increasing now.

Mr. WIER. So I say to this House as a friend of education, that this is a very blighted part of our needs in this country; it is a positive neglect in the interest of the ability of our Nation and our Government to provide any type of education for thousands and thousands of our children.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. Would the gentleman suggest how we might proceed in order to get additional money to cover all these projects that are eligible under the law?

Mr. WIER. I think there were about 500 applications from school districts all over the country that could qualify under the act of last year. I venture to say that nearly one-third of those applications will not receive any money whatsoever because they are not the hardest pressed, nor will there be enough money to fulfill the entire obligation.

The only suggestion I can make during debate on this appropriation bill is that on the basis of the applications that the Department has today and that they have qualified as being eligible under Public Law 815 for participation, that the amount of money they find necessary today will be necessary during the next 2 years at least in lieu of our preparation and emergency program. I do not know of a community down South, in the Middle West, or in the Northeast that is going to be removed from this picture; as a matter of fact, I think in each one of these communities it will be increased.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. If the gentleman will yield, he might include certain sections of the west coast.

Mr. WIER. I was not out on the west coast; I am speaking only of the places I saw.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. I was eager, therefore, for the RECORD to show that there are areas throughout the country that are in just as serious condition. I am somewhat familiar with the situation referred to by the gentleman from Michigan and can confirm what he said. And in Richmond, Calif., where the population doubled within a few months, the city manager, speaking about the problem said:

The Government has cheated our children of an education; there are children in junior high school who have never gone to school a full day because of lack of facilities to take care of them.

Mr. WIER. I am aware that the same situation exists in a number of places in the State of Washington: Hanford, for example, Seattle, and Portland, Oreg.; and I think you could go right down the west coast to San Diego.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. It is a national problem.

Mr. WIER. It is a national problem. I made reference only to those places that I visited to show this picture in its nakedness.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think that if this appropriation is cut by the committee that we would be doing serious harm to our educational system all over this Nation. In fact the appropriation for construction and maintenance should be raised above the amounts now appearing in the bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. It is not a question of being cut; it is a question if it is not raised by this Congress.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Oklahoma is correct.

I served on the Burke subcommittee, but only attended the hearing in Kentucky and acquainted myself with the specific problem that we have in Kentucky. I visited Fort Knox with the subcommittee. At Fort Knox we have approximately 150,000 acres that have been taken over by the Federal Government for expanding the military installation there, and as a result the schools surrounding the Fort Knox area are greatly overcrowded. They do not have adequate school buildings; they do not have the supplies, and, in addition, the counties surrounding this Fort Knox area have lost millions of dollars of taxable property.

The net result is that the school districts do not have sufficient money to spend for the education of the children brought about by overcrowded conditions in these federally impacted areas, and this legislation only applies to those areas.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. I am in complete accord with what the gentleman states. The difficulty I find, however, is that what we have here in the form of an appropriation is merely enough to scratch the surface. The question involved today seems to me to be one where we still have to increase this appropriation, otherwise we are not going to accomplish anything. We are just fooling the people with what we have in this bill.

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with the gentleman that the amount should be raised. The Office of Education informs me they have approximately 700 applications. Only 100 have received assistance. The Office of Education has undertaken to set up a priority system to give the more seriously impacted areas some relief but on account of the lack of funds the whole program has bogged down. That is not only true with reference to the construction phase of this program, it is also true as to maintenance and operation.

In Kentucky a total of 10 school districts submitted applications for Federal assistance under construction of school facilities under Public Law 815. Based on a preliminary review of the applications these school districts are entitled to receive more than \$2,000,000 accord-

ing to the Office of Education. These districts submitted a total of 21 construction projects to use up this entitlement. They requested \$1,773,000 in Federal funds for construction and pledged a total of \$946,362 in local funds. The \$31,500,000 available for construction under section 202 of the act will only permit an allotment to less than 100 projects all over the Nation.

In my State, construction of school facilities on Federal property, on military installations at Fort Campbell and Fort Knox and Fort Breckinridge are now suffering from the lack of funds. I just mention these instances in Kentucky because the same situation prevails all over the Nation. Authorization, however, has been given for two of the military installations to proceed with construction in Kentucky while the application of the other is being held up on account of insufficient funds. We all know that Federal ownership of property reduces local tax income for school purposes, and we also know that a military installation or defense installation brings about an influx of persons into a community, resulting in an increased number of children to be educated. We are confronted with the problem, and we must solve it to the best of our ability.

The estimated requirements for temporary facilities for the next school year under section 203 of the act in two critical defense areas, Paducah, Ky., and Savannah River area, South Carolina, amount to \$10,000,000. It has been estimated that if all the projects were approved that are now eligible to be approved under Public Law 815, approximately \$350,000,000 would be necessary to fully implement the different provisions, sections 202, 203, and 204 of Public Law 815. This is not considering the maintenance and operation appropriation.

You can readily see that if they need \$10,000,000 for those two critical defense areas at Paducah and on the Savannah River, the Office of Education will have very little money left for these other impacted areas all over the Nation, which goes to show that the entire amount as recommended by the committee is entirely inadequate and should be raised.

Mr. ALBERT. Does it not come down to this one proposition, that either the Office of Education has failed to make its case or the Bureau of the Budget has put a muzzle on it? The committee has informed the House that the Office of Education has not made out a case for additional money.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the latter is true. The Bureau of the Budget has not given this problem the consideration it rightfully deserves and, of course, the impact is constantly getting worse on account of world conditions.

I am hopeful that the Appropriations Committee in the Senate will give this problem the utmost consideration, and that the Office of Education will also take another look at the picture. I personally believe the appropriations contained in this bill for the purpose of taking care of the school districts in these federally impacted areas are entirely inadequate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the act, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$175,000,000, of which \$100,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head: *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to that part of the appropriation granted herein which is available for new obligations.

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FURCOLO: Page 21, line 13, strike out "\$175,000,000" and insert in its place the figure "\$250,000,000."

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer is on page 21, line 13, where there will be a substitution of the figure \$175,000,000 to make it read \$250,000,000.

I think that probably everyone here is familiar with this hospital-construction program. There was a great deal of talk about it last year, and what it has to do with is this: Originally, as I understand, there was to be \$150,000,000 for such hospital-construction program. As the result of the economic situation it was thought advisable to try and cut that down. Now, probably many of you have had communities where the people of the community have gone out, have raised money, have made plans to build these hospitals. I understand there is a very great need for them throughout the country.

Now, all of us here are trying to do what we can as far as economy is concerned. However, it seems to me in this situation where, as is generally agreed, there is a definite need for such facilities where, as I think all of us will readily admit, the people of the communities have gone out, have raised money, and have shown good faith in reliance on what the Government has in effect promised, that we should not go back upon our word and our responsibility. This amendment, if adopted, will, in effect, let the Government keep its word to all of the communities who acted in reliance on the Government authorization.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I am interested in the gentleman's statement that the Government has given its word. Would the gentleman elaborate on the significance of just what has been done from which he draws the inference that the Government has given its word on any specific sum?

Mr. FURCOLO. I have drawn that inference from the original authorization and also from the fact that in reliance upon that authorization people throughout the Nation in these various communities went out, had bond issues,

raised money, and many of them engaged architects and had plans drawn and went ahead in reliance on what they assumed actually was a representation of the Government.

Mr. KEATING. Who made the representation as to what would be allowed?

Mr. FURCOLO. Well, I assume that it was first done here by Congress by the original authorization and then from that I suppose by the proper governmental agencies.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGRATH. The gentleman knows full well that the mere passage of an authorization bill does not commit the Government. He knows further, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that no agency or no official of any agency has the authority to bind the Government just because an authorization bill has been passed.

Mr. FURCOLO. That is right. The mere fact that an authorization bill has been passed, of course, in itself is not conclusive, but may I also ask the gentleman from New York this question? Is it not a fact that in reliance upon representations made by duly constituted people in the Government and as the result of the belief that this money would be forthcoming, that plans were undertaken in all communities; that people went out to raise money through bond issues, in many cases with the approval of people in the Government, that architects were engaged, and things of that nature? May I ask if that is not roughly the situation?

Mr. McGRATH. My very dear friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO] knows, on the premise he has set forth, what the answer would have to be.

Mr. FURCOLO. Would not the answer be "Yes"?

Mr. McGRATH. No. Of course, the gentleman's facts are not correct. Because an authorization is made does not justify anyone going out and seeking to employ architects.

Mr. FURCOLO. May I ask the gentleman from New York whether or not it is not a fact that as the result of the authorization and as the result of action taken by the governmental authorities, that the people of this Nation, in various communities, in good faith, acting on the reliance of that premise, did go out and do these things that I suggested? And is it not further a fact that practically all of the members of this committee have been aware of that, but that it is as the result of economy that this cut was made? Is that not the situation?

Mr. McGRATH. No, I do not agree with the gentleman at all. Some communities may have anticipated what would be done in the future, but in so doing they took the risk of their own decision.

Mr. FURCOLO. I think without any question the record shows, and the people in the communities throughout the Nation know, that acting in reliance upon an authorization and upon what

people in this Government had done, they went out in many communities and raised money, had plans drawn, and actually committed themselves in many ways, relying upon the word of the Government to carry through.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. Is the gentleman's amendment to increase the appropriation from \$175,000,000 to \$250,000,000?

Mr. FURCOLO. Actually it is \$75,000,000 more for the building.

Mr. JONAS. I am for that program. Without any question the gentleman knows that practically throughout the whole United States, in the large cities as well as in the smaller cities, there is a shortage of bed space in hospitals. The people in these communities on account of the economic conditions and the high cost of living and the high cost of building have ceased to make contributions from the standpoint of private enterprise. If we are going to do something for the ill and the indigent from a humane standpoint, we have to look to the Government. I do not call this socialism, I call it good common sense.

Mr. FURCOLO. You cannot economize on dollars and cents where the health and lives of many people in the country are concerned.

All of us are in favor of economy, but this is not good economy. It is not sound economy where the Government in effect goes back on its word. It is not sound economy where the Government has asked the people of this Nation to contribute something to this program and they have done it, and then in effect we say to them, "We are sorry, we are going back on our word. The price of labor is going up. You have engaged architects, had blueprints made, located the land, and your people have contributed money, but we are going back on our word."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. On the matter of authorization, not giving anybody the right to assume that an appropriation would be made, I think, however, that all of these people who have eligible projects have just as much right to assume that their projects will be taken care of as somebody who is going to be taken care of under this appropriation bill.

Mr. FURCOLO. I agree with the gentleman.

As a matter of fact, there is a little bit more here than just an authorization. There is not only an authorization but also, as a result of that authorization, people throughout this Nation acted in reliance upon what they thought was the good faith of the Government.

No one in the Government before last year, at which time everything had already been done, indicated to them, "This is not going to be done." Whether legally or strictly or technically it amounts to anything is another question, but morally and in good faith

there is no question at all, in my opinion, that the Government is not acting right with the people if they do not carry through with this project.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that his amendment calls for an addition of \$75,000,000, whereas the Budget Bureau requested only \$20,000,000 additional.

Mr. FURCOLO. It is interesting about the Bureau of the Budget. In my short experience here I have noticed that when someone does not want to do anything different than the Bureau of the Budget wants, he says, "This has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget." As soon as somebody wants to do something that has not been approved by the Bureau of the Budget, then the talk is, "Who is going to run this country, the Congress or the Bureau of the Budget?"

I do not say that either one is exactly right, but certainly the opinion of the Bureau of the Budget does not do more than create a rebuttable presumption. The facts here, in my opinion, justify us in overriding the Bureau of the Budget's opinion.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes, so that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. FURCOLO. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURNSIDE. I want to thank the gentleman for offering his amendment. In the State of West Virginia we have 15 to 20 of these cases where they need hospitals and need them very badly. In this city of Huntington, a city of about 92,000 people, we have only six beds in case of an epidemic. I think the gentleman is entirely correct in stating that there are many different cities which went out and sold bonds. In Huntington they have already raised the funds and now the funds are idle and the people have to pay interest on the funds. I think the gentleman is entirely correct and is to be commended for the kind of amendment that he has offered.

Mr. FURCOLO. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I might say this: We are not going to save any money if we do not do it now. These facilities are going to be needed. The only thing that is going to happen is that we are going to waste some of the money that many of the people have put up in trying to provide the funds. Interest will have to be paid on that money. The cost of materials is going up and the cost of labor is going up. Some day in the very near future they are going to have to have these facilities. They will simply have to be built at some later time at a far greater cost.

I do not want to be pessimistic, but if we pay any attention at all to the fact that eventually we may need greater hospital facilities as a result, perhaps, of the action of some other nation, we cannot begin to build the facilities after that happens.

I think from every possible point of view, in keeping faith with the people and on the basis of a true and sound economy the amendment should be carried, and I hope it will.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 25 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

(Mr. JAVITS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, this being an appropriation bill, I should say we are very much interested in the facts. I happen to have some facts or I would not be taking the time of the House today. I wrote the Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission of the State of New York, and I have a letter from the executive director, Dr. John J. Bourke, telling me just what the situation is in New York. I think the House ought to know it because I believe it does justify a more ample allowance for the support of hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act by the Federal establishment. I have no illusions as to the desire of the House to vote a \$75,000,000 increase. But I think these facts are important in determining our policy upon appropriations, and what I am going to talk about now relates to the policy that this appropriation ought to be more ample than it is.

In New York State the commission has authorized 62 Hill-Burton projects—on 54 of which work is proceeding—which call for an expenditure—and this is a very important matter to economy advocates—of \$54,000,000 but of which the Federal Government is only going to contribute one-third. So difficult has the situation been for the State of New York, by allowances which have been made available to it under Hill-Burton appropriations made last year which were very sharply cut, that it has had to put hospital projects on a split basis, telling the hospitals to go ahead and proceed with their construction in the expectation that they will get allocations from the Federal Government.

As a result of that situation the State of New York is faced, if it gets its part of what is provided for in this bill, with an allowance from Federal funds of three and a quarter million dollars this year, but 2½ million dollars are already devoted to going projects and it will only leave the whole State of New York about \$690,000 for other projects.

The executive director of New York State's Joint Hospital Survey and Planning Commission tells me that in New York City alone 20 to 25 million dollars are needed as Hill-Burton contributions for hospitals are a necessity to the community. In Nassau County right outside of New York City, \$3,000,000 is needed on the basis of estimated costs and a 33⅓ percent grant. In the city of Rochester, which may interest my colleague from that city, \$2,000,000 are needed, and in the city of Utica \$1,750,000 is needed on the same basis.

Mr. Chairman, the point is simply this, that building hospitals is not inflationary. Building hospitals is essential to our national security and national safety. Building hospitals represents an asset which is better than money and a great deal better than the gold buried in the ground at Fort Knox, and represents the creation of an asset and putting some of our resources into an asset vital to the future of our people. It is not inflationary to build hospitals for the benefit of the people of the State of New York or of any other State, and certainly it is essential to our national defense. When the program is established by as dependable a State agency as New York State's Hospital Survey Commission which finds it is needed and can be but insufficiently supplied under existing law despite the fact that two-thirds of the money comes from State and local sources, and when they emphasize that most of those hospitals, 83 percent of them, are voluntary nonprofit, nonsectarian, Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish hospitals, the program appears to be eminently justified. You are not creating new Government facilities here but rather making it possible for Americans by voluntary means to help themselves.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HALE. There are several hospitals in Maine which are left stranded by the failure to appropriate adequately under this hospital legislation, the Hill-Burton Act, and they are hospitals which were started on the faith of this legislation. These partially completed projects certainly merit some consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. It seems to me we are here not only to save money but we are here to appropriate money where the money is deserved. That is our duty and that is our responsibility. It is clear, both on the grounds of solid benefit to the country and on the grounds of national defense, that we ought to have an attitude of greater consideration with respect to the hospital provision of this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this is a very popular proposal. There are a great many fine things proposed in this bill. I would like to go along with them. A lot of folks in my country need hospitals but I wonder if we cannot stop and look and listen this

morning, and think about the over-all question of the state of the economy of this Nation and what is going to happen if we yield to every request that comes here to do some of these fine things that we would all love to do.

We have been talking about economy here. You hear a lot about economy. Every man who gets up to offer an amendment says, "I am for economy but I am for economy for the other fellow." I spoke to one of my colleagues the other day in the cloakroom, and I said, "Now I think we have all got to sacrifice a little bit if we are going to balance the budget, if we are going to stop piling these taxes onto the people that they cannot pay. We are going to have to cut and cut everywhere." My friend said something that is typical of the situation. He said, "Yes, Judge; I am for doing it, and I will give them the very shirt off your back."

Is that what we are going to do here? I am for cutting these appropriations instead of adding to them, and I am going to try to have the courage to stand up here and vote to do it. And if it hurts me in my district it is going to have to hurt me. What are you going to do about these things? They are going to be coming up every minute in the day on every appropriation bill that comes up. They are things that you would like your people to have, but can we not stop and think about the sad state of the budget of this Nation, and whether we are going to continue to run a deficit, whether we are going to continue to pile up taxes to the point where the people cannot pay them? Let us think about this.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I want to publicly commend the gentleman for the position he has taken. He is entirely right. He has the courage to state his position. It is time that instead of voting to increase appropriations the House should vote to cut them further than they actually have been cut by our Appropriation Committee. The American people are demanding economy in Government.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I thank the gentleman. Let us do it on this bill and all the rest of them as they come along.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY] is recognized.

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no argument on the question as to whether or not it would be a fine thing to build more hospitals for our country. There are other serious matters to be taken into consideration on this appropriation in addition to economy.

The gentleman's amendment boosts the appropriation by \$75,000,000. That is \$55,000,000 more than was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Our Subcommittee on Appropriations held extensive hearings. The testimony with respect to this particular appropri-

ation will be found beginning on page 633 of the printed hearing.

But here is the problem with which we are confronted. Even if they had this \$250,000,000, under the defense emergency program they could not possibly get the material to build the hospitals. Furthermore the drain by our armed services on the doctors and hospital personnel of our country has created a tremendous shortage in these professions. Furthermore, even if they had these hospitals, they could not possibly get the doctors and personnel to staff them. These are some of the major circumstances you have to take into consideration when considering boosting this appropriation \$75,000,000.

Every Member of this House is getting letters from his district asking him to cut the budget, to economize. You are going to get a lot more letters next year when the people get their new tax bill and wonder why you do not decrease appropriations.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. JONAS. Does my colleague from Illinois take the position that the additional appropriation of \$55,000,000 will completely overthrow, disrupt, and destroy the whole economic background of this country when we here every day are pouring out billions for war, billions for munitions, billions for outside questions, billions for appropriation to foreign countries, yet if we talk about spending \$55,000,000 for the sick, the indigent and suffering people of America it will ruin the country?

Mr. BUSBEY. I do not take that position. If the gentleman from Illinois wants to take it he can, but I do not. There are a lot of hospitals already authorized towards which we have appropriated some money, and new ones that have been contracted for. Furthermore, there is the cost necessary to build all these hospitals in all the communities of the country. Not but that it is good, but in the last few years we have had hospitalization programs by hospital promotion groups, and it has been so oversold that the people of the communities cannot afford to support them.

Mr. JONAS. Does not the gentleman know that these hospital promotion programs have all fallen by the wayside and are gradually disappearing? Does he not know that the hospitals we now have cannot take care of the sick people because the local communities find the burden too heavy to bear? It has gotten to be a national program; the National Government must aid in the construction of more hospitals.

Mr. BUSBEY. I will ask the gentleman a question: What is the sense of appropriating money when you cannot get the materials or the personnel with which to staff the hospitals if they are built?

Mr. JONAS. It is a sad commentary upon the intelligence of thinking people to put forth the proposition that we cannot spare material to aid the sick and suffering. If that be the case, then it is about time we made a change in the pro-

gram and paid some attention to the sick.

Mr. BUSBEY. I stand with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH]: You are either going to be economy-minded, or you are not going to be economy-minded.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] is recognized.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the gentleman from Virginia has well stated that we cannot afford at this time to accept any amendments to this bill which would increase the total of the money carried in the bill. We are in a very difficult position financially, and I cannot vote for an increase, even though it is for one of the most worthy projects such as aid to hospital construction. There are many things which are very desirable but which cannot be pushed as rapidly as we would like at a time like this, when we are threatened with an all-out war. I should like, however, to see an amendment in the form of a substitute for the gentleman's amendment agreed to whereby we could provide in this bill that priority shall be given by the various States in the allocation of new construction funds to those projects which are most advanced at this time in planning and financing. It is my intention to offer such an amendment.

Please allow me to call to your attention what the good people of one of my communities, Madison, Minn., have been up against in their wish to secure a much-needed hospital.

In December 1949 public-spirited citizens of that community worked hard to raise funds for Madison's contribution to the hospital. A total of 1,095 contributors pledged \$186,044 and the project seemed to be well on the way. On March 15, 1950, that community was informed by the Minnesota Department of Health that—

We have now decided that we will include general hospital projects on the 1950 construction schedule down to and including Madison. Because of the fact that your project involves Federal funds which are not as yet available to the State, we cannot encumber funds for this project until after the 1951 fiscal allotment becomes available, which should be about July 1, 1950.

Naturally, the Madison community looked forward hopefully to the summer of 1950 for their plans for a new hospital to become a reality. Plans and specifications were developed and a total of \$38,000 was spent by the hospital board for site, architects' fees, and such. No Federal money, however, was available and today this project lies dormant, a year after having been virtually assured that construction would commence last July.

Members of the House, place yourselves in the positions of members of that hospital board. What can they say to the 1,095 contributors who 17 months ago put up \$186,044 on the promise contained in the Hill Burton Act. That the Federal Government would aid in giving to them a hospital to replace the present fire trap constructed in 1900. Ten thousand people in that county

need that hospital. It is because of cases such as Madison, Minn., and others scattered throughout the United States of like need, that I believe that the Congress should indicate in this bill its belief and intent that such communities, far advanced as they are in planning and financing, should be assured of priority as far as the new money, \$75,000,000 contained in this bill, is concerned.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. If the gentleman will read the table in the hearings, he will find that the smaller communities as such have received the bulk of the money rather than the larger cities.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That may appear to be the case but the facts remain that there seems to be no money available now for this project. The gentleman will recall that we had a supplemental hearing before the Bureau of Public Health last December on this very issue. There the question came up as to how much money would be required as far as the Congress was concerned if we were to allocate sufficient additional funds over and above the \$75,000,000 given last year so as to take care of these few projects scattered out in every State of the Union in which the people had worked hard to bring to a virtual completion their planning and financing, but just could not seem to get under the gate as far as receiving some of these Federal funds was concerned.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McGRATH. I call to the attention of the gentleman that the allotment for his State of Minnesota is \$1,520,000 and that the item to which he refers in the Madison case calls for about \$228,000.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is correct. I am simply urging that we make sure that the \$228,000 will be available. No definite priority is in this bill for the hospitals mentioned.

Mr. McGRATH. In this bill there is sufficient allotment and that project to which he refers will be taken care of under this appropriation.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I wish the gentleman could assure me that this \$228,000 will be available. There are so many turns and twists in the road that I fear that small hospitals such as Madison will be kept at the bottom of the list, while large hospitals already under construction will secure more than their previously allocated share, so as to be rushed to completion in spite of the cost of materials and labors going up 15 to 20 percent the past year. It is because of this reasoning, that I propose to offer an amendment to give priority to the many small hospitals, of which Madison is but an example.

Mr. Chairman, in spite of the interest I have naturally in my own project at Madison, I want to reiterate that I cannot vote for any amendment increasing this bill today. We can, however, help in seeing to it that the various States

allocate their share of the pending \$75-000,000 in such a way as to again restore faith in Uncle Sam's promise. Communities which have shown their good faith through their fund raising and their commitments should be given first consideration in this distribution of the money available this coming July 1, under this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH].

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I recognize at the outset that to speak against a construction program for hospitals is not a very popular thing.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. May I say to the gentleman that I am very much disturbed about the pending amendment which proposes an increase from \$175,000,000 in appropriations to \$250,000,000. The country cannot afford any more than it has at present. They were able to take care of almost everything last year with the \$175,000,000 and they will be able to do the same thing next year.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of economy, but I am not in favor of false economy. I believe the pending amendment proposing to increase hospital funds should be agreed to. Hospital construction under the Hill-Burton Act, to my way of thinking, has made a great contribution in promoting the general welfare of the people in this country. As a result of this legislation, hospital treatment has been provided for the sick and indigent where otherwise such treatment would have been impossible. Many sections of our country still need hospitals and the people residing in those districts are looking into the future with the hope that they may be able to acquire funds under the Hill-Burton Act and construct needed hospitals.

In my district last fall one of the large counties voted by a majority of approximately 9,000 to 400 in favor of a hospital bond issue in order that they may be in a position to match funds provided under the Hill-Burton Act. The construction of this hospital in Floyd County, Ky., will require \$800,000 of Hill-Burton funds besides the one-third that the county is authorized to put up. A loan has been approved for preparation of plans for this hospital. The project has been approved by the State Department of Health and by the United States Public Health Service. The hospital is badly needed, and when completed and properly equipped, will serve a great area in the Big Sandy Valley. The people of Floyd County are very hopeful that their project may be completed in the near future. From a defense standpoint these hospitals that have been authorized should be completed. I mention this particular hospital, although I know there are numerous similar situations throughout the country. I personally fear that \$75,-

000,000 provided for in the appropriations bill for new construction is inadequate. For that reason, I am supporting the amendment to increase the appropriation.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the committee to the fact that the committee unanimously allowed the full budget estimate of \$75,000,000 for new allotments. One hundred million dollars goes to pay off contract authorizations and the additional \$75,000,000 goes for new construction. As of January 1951 there was a total of 1,497, roughly 1,500 projects that had been approved embracing about 73,000 beds and 225 community Public Health centers. We recognize at this time the difficulty of getting materials and because of that fact among others this appropriation has been held to this amount. I call your attention to the fact that at the present time there is approximately \$800,000,000 worth of hospital construction going on in the country. The distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Furcolo] said that there was perhaps a moral obligation upon the Federal Government because there had been an authorization bill passed. Of course, the fallacy of that reasoning, I think, was pointed out very well by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keating] because if that was to follow, every time you passed an authorization bill you might just as well put in the appropriation at the same time and eliminate any hearings or examination as to whether or not the money should be allocated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. Furcolo: Page 21, line 19, after "obligations" strike out the period and insert "Provided, That the funds provided for new obligations shall be allotted on a basis of priority to those projects most advanced in the planning and financing as determined by the several States."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the substitute that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. There is no question in my mind, Mr. Chairman, but what this amendment is germane. Certainly it is nothing but a limitation upon the expenditure of a portion of the funds contained in this particular paragraph. If we say, for example, that the states must allocate new funds in relation to the state of advancement as far as the projects are concerned, certainly that is a limitation, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard in opposition to the observation made by the gentleman from Minnesota?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. McGRATH. I respectfully submit to the Chair that the Hill-Burton Act sets forth the priorities to be given

to the states and herefore his is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is not germane. Being a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that brought this legislation to the House authorizing this program, I recall vividly the policy was adopted in that authorization program which left administration of the funds to the States, after the funds were made available. The authority to determine the utilization of the funds made available for the carrying out of this program is left to the States. Should a limitation such as the gentleman offered here be adopted, that would mean we would deviate from that policy established under the authorization of the program and consequently I think it would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the Chair permit a further observation?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The Chair will notice in line 16 the provision "That allotments under such part C to the several States" and so forth and so on. If that provision is germane and in order, as it appears to be, why should not a further provision as to how the State shall allot the money, based upon the degree of advancement, be germane? The gentleman from Arkansas should either make a point of order against that provision also or withdraw his opposition to mine.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PRICE). The Chair is ready to rule.

After studying the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, the Chair feels that this is a change in existing law, and therefore sustains the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

In regard to the second point raised by the gentleman, the Chair holds that because other legislative language may be permitted to remain in the bill, that does not make in order language adding legislation in violation of the rules.

The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order submitted by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JAVITS to the amendment offered by Mr. Furcolo: On page 21, line 13, strike out "\$250,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$195,000,000."

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would it be in order to offer a preferential motion at this time, and if offered, could it be debated?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair cannot rule on a hypothetical question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CRAWFORD moves that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Furcolo amendment be again read.

There being no objection, the Clerk again read the Furcolo amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth: For pay, uniforms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed 1,500 regular active commissioned officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular and reserve commissioned officers; for payment of claims for private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or damaged in the military service of the United States, as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 222c, h; 42 U. S. C. 213); and for 6 months' death gratuity pay and burial payments for regular commissioned officers; \$1,900,000, and the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from appropriations made available to the Public Health Service for the current fiscal year such additional amounts as may be necessary for pay and allowances of the officers herein authorized.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia: On page 26, line 8, strike out "\$1,900,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,790,000."

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this item appears in the committee report on page 34 in the table entitled "Title II—Federal Security Agency." It is the first item on the page of "commissioned officers, pay, etc." In 1951 the amount appropriated for this item was \$1,790,000. The amount in this bill is increased \$110,000. The subcommittee has done good work in reporting this bill in a number of ways and for that I wish to commend them and wish to say that I concur in that action. I feel, if it is possible to do so, no item in the bill should be increased. When I noticed the \$110,000 increase here I looked in the committee report to see what the justification for it was, and not finding any reference to it whatever I then discussed it with the subcommittee chairman and was informed that the justification for it is set out on pages 839, 840, and 841 of the hearings, which involve this particular agency and that this \$110,000 is supposed to pay for the retirement which is anticipated during the fiscal year of 19 commissioned officers. The testimony of Dr. Gillis with reference to that is as follows:

The estimated increase is due to provision for retirement of 19 additional officers. In view of the retirement of 2 officers for age is mandatory and 37 officers have the legal right to retire for years of service, and since past experience indicates an average of 17 retirements per year for disability in accordance with the Career Compensation Act, the estimate is very conservative.

I would take that to mean that year after year they would come along here

with a request for an increase in this bill of \$110,000, which does not seem to me to be a logical method of increase.

The Williams subcommittee last year investigated this agency and we investigated this particular part of the agency which is known as the Division of Commissioned Officers.

That subcommittee's report in dealing with this, had the following to say:

Another barrier to the attainment of good personnel management is found in the separate handling of the 2,141 commissioned officers in the Public Health Service. These officers are assigned throughout the service in both medical and administrative posts from a central division of commissioned officers with 72 employees assigned to its component branches as follows, and these are personnel employees which have a ratio of one personnel worker for every 30 officers. That is too large a ratio of personnel workers for the number of officers. Those 72 employees in the fiscal year 1950 were made up as follows:

Office of the chief, 6 employees; planning branch, 6; liaison branch, 9; recruitment and commission branch, 18; assignment and utilization branch, 6; training branch, 4; administrative management, 23.

Here are the duties of the administrative management as reported by them to that committee:

Administers program for assisting and advising officers and their dependents in obtaining benefits provided by law; reviews and processes disability claims; determines eligibility for campaign ribbons; arranges for authorization to wear decorations and medals; maintains liaison with Department of National Defense, Veterans' Administration and other agencies on matters of benefits and privileges; arranges for commissary and post-exchange privileges; provides income-tax-consultation service for commissioned officers.

The committee reached this conclusion regarding these 72 employees, particularly those 23 in administrative management:

Except for historical prerogative and a declining need for mobility in assignment, there is little justification for continuing this very elaborate and costly duplicate personnel office with a ratio of 1 personnel worker for every 30 officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know of a better place in the wide world to save \$110,000 than to vote for the amendment which the gentleman has offered. I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

In view of the extension of time, I would like to add to what I have already said that this is an agency in which the Williams subcommittee in its investi-

gation found that in the Federal Security Administration they maintained a purchasing operations division which employed 197 employees which processed a total number of orders per year of 121,014, 50 percent of which were under \$20 each, at an average cost of \$5 per order processed, and the number processed, the daily average per employee, was 2.4 orders, as I said at an average cost of \$5 per order, and 50 percent of them were under \$20.

As I stated, I think the committee has done good work in reducing the appropriations, but this is one item that has been increased. It is not justified in the committee report, and the justification which is given is what I have given you here, and I think the \$110,000 should be cut out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as many Members have done, I have spent a great many years of my life working in the areas of health and disease. May I say that I am very happy that you have seen fit not to make an additional cut in the mental hygiene appropriation.

I am taking these few minutes, Mr. Chairman, in order to suggest to you that it is time for us, as guardians of the purse strings, to consider as possible fields for research the basic causes of such things as mental unbalance and illness. To illustrate my meaning, I would like to refer the older Members of the House to a bill which I introduced some years ago to iodize salt to make readily available to the great masses of our people the ingredient necessary to health of body and mind in order to reduce the number of feeble-minded, mentally unfit, deaf mutes, and such that we are breeding in increasing numbers. My bill was rather dramatically killed by a parliamentary procedure on the floor, which prevented its coming to a vote. Did you know that every single soldier who went into the Army in the last war had nothing but iodized salt?

It has been definitely established by 30 years of research that iodine is absolutely necessary to sanity and healthful glandular activity. If you put two bricks of salt in a field, one iodized and one not, the cows will take the iodized salt every time. I could give you many illustrations of that nature.

Also, one of our South American Republics was virtually free of goiter corollaries. Then suddenly they began to have it. One of the research men was sent down from here at the request of their government. He found that the goiter began at the time when a very up and coming fellow had come up to the United States and liked the white salt on our tables. When he returned home he set up a factory and refined the salt, and goiters appeared.

I have given you this as an illustration of what basic research can teach us. Assuring the masses of our people a requisite amount of this necessary ingredient is one of the things that we could do to lower the number of people

for whom we now have to supply nurses and doctors and others.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other similar things that could be done fundamentally in the whole broad field of research. May I urge upon the Members of this body, and especially upon whatever subcommittee has to do not only with the health appropriations but also with the study of the various health measures that come to this Congress usually through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would urge it upon us all to do some very fundamental study between now and the next session of this Congress. It is evident that we must reduce expenditures. Let us reduce them in such ways that will bring benefit to our people rather than having to reduce them by having fewer hospitals than are now needed to care for our sick, for the 250,000 GI's who are mentally undone by this war, and for other tragedies of our civilization. Let us see what we can do to do away with the causes, let us not go on forever dealing merely with results of poor management.

I urge this, Mr. Chairman, and hope very much that during this next year because of very necessity we will force ourselves to look into these matters from this more basic point of view.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in the statement of the lady from Ohio [Mrs. Bolton] on the subject of iodine. I realize that iodized salt is better than no iodine at all. Iodine comes from the sea. The States that border on the ocean, and especially the ones that border on the Gulf of Mexico, have the most iodine in their soil, and therefore the people in those States have the least amount of goiter or thyroid trouble.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. They also, however, have an increasing amount of cretinism, dementism, and various things of that kind.

Mr. RANKIN. Those maladies are caused by a lack of iodine; they are unknown in those States that have an abundance of iodine in their soil.

We have virtually eliminated malaria, typhoid, yellow fevers, hookworm, and various other diseases that were causing so much trouble in Mississippi, and many other Southern States.

Mississippi has more iodine in her soil than has any other State in the Union, except Florida and south Texas. If you people in the Northern States who come from the goiter areas—and you can get maps which will show you exactly where those areas are—if you want to get rid of goiter or thyroid trouble, the thing to do is to take no chances on artificially iodized salt, but to eat foods that are produced in those areas where the soil is saturated with iodine, especially in the southern areas.

If you would eat more sweet potatoes, molasses, and dairy products from Mississippi, you would protect yourselves against those maladies.

I remember serving in this Congress at a time when there were four Members from one of the Northern States who had been operated on for goiter. They came from a State that has no iodine in her soil.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I would like to hear the gentleman's observation on the iodine content of Florida oranges.

Mr. RANKIN. I would like to answer the lady from Ohio. But if you want the facts, I desire to say that there is nothing produced in this country that carries a greater percentage of iodine than the fruit grown in Florida and south Texas. Florida oranges and grapefruit, as well as oranges and grapefruit from south Texas, have more iodine than has any other such foods grown in this country. The same thing is true of milk products from Mississippi and other Southern States. The sweetpotato comes nearer having all the food values than any other one thing that is grown in the United States. And they all come from the Southern States, where the soil is saturated with iodine.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Would the gentleman say the same thing with reference to oleomargarine?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; if it is made from cottonseed oil.

If the gentleman wants the people of his State to get rid of thyroid trouble the thing to do is to drink milk produced in Mississippi.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Could I get a testimonial from the gentleman for Iowa corn?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes, I was just about to get to corn.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I did not do so bad by eating a lot of pork and beef either.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly not.

Mr. JENSEN. I am a pretty good example of what a person can grow to if he eats good corn and Iowa corn flakes as well as pork and beef.

Mr. RANKIN. May I also say that if you will get rid of this one-way freight rate you people are being punished with, as we are, so that you can process your own animal and corn products and ship them east instead of having to pay a double freight rate when you ship them, the people of Iowa will be a great deal better off.

Mr. FELLOWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. FELLOWS. This also involves a mental question, does it not?

Mr. RANKIN. A mental question? I have been told that thyroid trouble, and

especially goiters, affects an individual's mind. I want to say to the gentleman from Maine that his rain comes from the sea. His area is fairly well supplied with iodine. But when you get to certain areas where the water does not come from the sea you will find the reverse to be true. I made an investigation, and in one State, I will not name it, they recorded 100 percent of the school children in a certain city as being affected with thyroid trouble.

This is one of the most serious questions that has come before the Congress, and I am telling you now that I do not believe you can ever cure it with iodized salt, although it does have a beneficial effect. If you will eat the foods that come from that part of the South where the soil is saturated with iodine, you will find it to be a great deterrent to the contraction and development of goiter, one of the most dangerous diseases in America.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

(Mr. RANKIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL].

(Mr. VURSELL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment to reduce this appropriation bill further, by \$110,000.

First, however, I want to compliment and commend the members of the Appropriations Committee that has shown such a tenacity for economy in Government at a time when it was never more needed than it is in this particular session of the Congress. I also want to commend all of the members of the committee of the House who have helped defeat the prior amendment which would have increased this appropriation bill by \$75,000,000.

The people of our country are greatly concerned. I think the letters that are coming in, even those before the MacArthur incident, indicate that the people are concerned about the future of this Government and concerned about what the Congress may do, whether or not they, the citizens of the United States who really are the Government, may get a measure of relief from the Congress of the United States.

They are more concerned now than they were ever before, and they are looking to Congress now with greater intensity and greater hope, and may I say greater concern, than ever before.

Congress has made a splendid start in acting upon the appropriation bills that have come before this body recently. We can give the people some consolation and some hope for the future

that no other person in government can give them, which they are so intently hoping for if we continue to show them that we are trying to protest their interest and continue to show them that we will continue to stand fast for economy throughout this session.

I know there are likely to be those who will offer amendments to this bill to undo the work this splendid committee has done, to increase the appropriations, later on as we read the bill. I want to speak to you now and urge the Members of Congress to turn back and defeat every attempt to increase appropriations in this bill, and I hope that we will indicate our determination to do that by reducing this bill now by \$110,000 by approving this amendment.

We can give the people hope and consolation if we continue to stand fast for economy on the floor of this House not only for this bill, but as the days and weeks come. When we reduce spending, we lighten the tax load that much on the people. Congress has a great responsibility. You Members of the House have shown an inclination to measure up and face up to that responsibility. I hope we may continue to do so today and throughout this session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has given careful consideration to every request by the agencies that have appeared before it over a period of several weeks. You will notice in the tabulation at the back of the report that practically every estimate that was presented to the committee has been cut for fiscal year 1952. But I believe the significant thing in the report is that this committee cut practically every agency that appeared before it below what they had available in 1951—not the estimate, but we have cut below what they had to operate with in 1951. This relatively small item for commissioned officers' pay is one of the few items in the bill that shows an increase over last year. It shows an increase of \$110,000. That entire increase is made up of one thing, and that is for retired pay of officers of the Public Health Service and for survivors' benefits. That is all there is to it. It does not add any jobs to the Public Health rolls. That \$110,000 is made up completely of retirement pay for officers serving in the Public Health Service on the same basis as officers in the Army, in the Navy, and in the Coast Guard, and for survivors' benefits; for the survivors of those officers who have died whose survivors are eligible to receive benefits. That is what the entire \$110,000 amounts to. That is why we allowed it because we could not rationally do anything else. There is in the record a table showing the net increase of retired officers from 1947 to 1952. In 1947 there was a net increase of 22; in 1948, 12; in 1949, 16; in 1950, 28; and in 1951, 32. This next fiscal year, by the figures that we have, there will be 19 additional officers retired. This \$110,000 will go to meet that retirement pay and the bene-

fits that will be allowed for the survivors of the officers who died.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield, if they could reduce some unnecessary employees, however, and save \$110,000 they could use that money to pay this retirement, could they not?

Mr. FOGARTY. We believe the Public Health Service is one of the best-run agencies in the Government. The record has shown that they have decreased their personnel in administrative services in Public Health administration whenever this was possible. It is a conservative administration of the Government. It is an independent agency within the Federal Security Agency. This committee has been very much interested in it and its operations. For 1952, the budget estimates for it show 533 less positions, over-all, than they had for 1951. The committee reductions make that even a higher reduction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I want to join the others in congratulating the chairman of this subcommittee on the work he has done in the interest of Government economy. However, I am not ready to concede that even further cuts cannot be made. In this particular instance, may I ask the gentleman if the committee's figures in their appropriations for this commissioned officers' service contemplate the continued ratio of personnel employees to over-all employment of 1 to 30? What the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia intends to do is eliminate that elaborate and costly personnel ratio.

Mr. FOGARTY. The \$110,000 increase is mainly and solely for the purpose of paying retirement benefits to officers who have been retired in service and to pay survivors' benefits.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That may be well and good, but do you intend to continue personnel employment at the ratio of 1 to 30 employees in the agency?

Mr. FOGARTY. I may say to the gentleman, who has served as chairman of the special subcommittee investigating some of these Federal agencies, that we have had his report before our committee in connection with the Department of Labor, especially the Bureau of Labor Statistics, but it was not until this afternoon, until the gentleman from Georgia brought this particular portion of the report to my attention, that the committee knew anything about this part of it at all. If it had been brought specifically to our attention during our hearings we would have gone into it as we did into the other report on the Bureau of Labor Statistics. But let us not cut this \$110,000. I will guarantee that we will go into it in our hearings next year in view of the report the gentleman has issued. If we had had that item brought specifically to our attention, we would have gone into it, but let us not cut out survivors' benefits and retired pay under this provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Georgia) there were—ayes 95, noes 49.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance, \$1,600,000.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEATING: On page 28, line 23, strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert "\$1,463,400."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Is it not a fact that this agency shows an enormous increase in the number of employees at a time when outside employment ought to diminish their requirements?

Mr. KEATING. I think exactly what the gentleman has said is true. The record indicates the average number of employees in this agency for 1950 was 264, and the estimated number for 1951 is 273, and the estimated number for 1952 is 313. All of this is happening at the very time when there should be less need for public assistance and at a time when there is a real shortage in the labor market and fewer people are on public assistance, and consequently the workload to administer the program is less.

I call attention to the record wherein the gentleman from Rhode Island inquired of the witness, who was appearing on this particular item:

In this tight labor market we are in at the present time, does it not seem that a downward trend for aid to dependent children would continue?

And the witness said that it might. Further, she said:

I do not think all the States have done a thorough job in canvassing all their recipients as yet so there will probably be a continuing decrease in old-age and aid to dependent children because of certain amendments.

We all understood the need to make adequate provision for this activity, but here is a case, similar to the one we just passed upon, where the committee has increased the figure above the figure for last year at a time when the trend in the country, insofar as employment goes, is up.

I want to echo what was said by the gentleman from Georgia in complimenting the committee on the many instances where they have made substantial reductions. I think perhaps the experience which we had on the floor with reference to the previous appropriation bill which we considered a short while ago has had a salutary effect on the entire committee. I am happy to see certain of these reductions which have been made, which are so necessary in these times of unusual defense expenditures. However, I hope that, like the previous amendment, this amendment will be accepted so that at least we will not, by the action we take, increase the amounts allowed over the amounts appropriated

last year for these administrative purposes.

I cannot understand why there should be need for additional employees. The alleged justification for this item appears on page 18 of the report, where it says it is to take care of within-grade salary advancements, projection of positions approved for a portion of the current year to a full-year basis, and additional expenses to handle increased work arising out of certain amendments.

It is not stated in the report that it is intended to increase the number of employees. However, it seems to me that in this particular activity it is definitely one of those cases where, instead of increasing the appropriation to take care of promotions, and that sort of thing, such needs should be absorbed and taken care of by a reduction in the number of personnel. As a matter of fact, I think I have probably been unduly conservative in merely trying to reduce this figure to the figure of last year. Certainly we should go that far.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman would also take into consideration the fact that in the Federal Security structure throughout the average wage or salary is \$4,500 a year, whereas in all other governmental departments the average is only \$3,600, so we can take that into consideration in voting for the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. KEATING. I agree with that. I would say to the gentleman along that line that my figures indicate that the average salary in this agency is \$4,908. It is estimated that the reduction which is sought by this amendment might eliminate 27 employees from the payroll, but that elimination would still leave on the payroll 22 more employees than they had in 1950.

In these times, in that type of activity, important as it is, it seems to me it would be inexcusable for us to allow them a larger sum than they were permitted to have last year. If we are to make the substantial budget reductions in nondefense spending so necessary to the maintenance of a sound economy and, I might add, so essential in the long run to our triumph over the forces of those who would destroy us, such action must be taken on items like the one to which this amendment is directed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what the average money is for each child in a dependent family.

Mr. FOGARTY. In 1950 the average monthly number of families was 602,078; in 1951, estimated at 665,000, and in 1952, estimated at 585,000. The average monthly payment was \$72.02 in 1950; \$72.50 estimated in 1951, and \$74.25 estimated in 1952.

Mr. NICHOLSON. That is per family?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLSON. It seems to me that this is a fair amendment. We have in every town, in the State that I come from at least, a welfare agent in each city and town, however big it is, more help than is necessary. Then the State comes in with their staff of visitors and looks out for welfare. Then we have the United States coming in and they have a right to because they pay half; so we have three sets of people doing one man's job.

I know plenty of cases in my State where men have died or have left their families, men who were making about \$40 a week, men with six children. When he runs off, or dies, that family immediately gets \$84 a week, \$44 more than the man ever brought to the family; and the family was getting along very well on the \$40.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these cases ought not to be acted on the same, whether there be three children in the family or eight, because it does not cost any more to heat a house for the eight than for the three; and a lot of other expenses are of the same nature, rent, and everything else, yet they have a policy of doing this for everybody, no matter what his condition may be or the condition the family might be in.

There is not any earthly reason so far as I can see to increase the number of investigators or the people going around to take care of these funds, because we have altogether too many now; one is enough. In the town in which I live, a town of 7,000 people, we know the conditions of practically everybody who gets old-age assistance, or is on public relief or who receives aid for dependent children; and there is no earthly need of anybody coming in from the State and then on top of that from the Federal Government overriding what the local welfare agency does. If the people in Massachusetts really knew what we were doing they would rise up and say "You have got to stop this." A woman with five illegitimate children gets \$72 a week to take care of them. No one in our State can look at the public welfare books to know what this thing costs.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NICHOLSON. I yield.

Mr. BROWNSON. The gentleman is bringing up a point which I think is very important; namely, the secrecy provisions of the Federal Security Act. Until they are amended to allow the States to publish this information so that the general public can find out about these billions we are pouring out it makes it very difficult and expensive to enforce. Our State of Indiana has already done that at their own risk of having these appropriations cut off. I now have a bill, H. R. 2738, pending before the House committee which proposes an amendment so that these facts may be published and so that more economy will result.

Mr. NICHOLSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I am certain that these things ought to be changed. We are supposed to be living in a prosperous country, yet here we are appropriating a billion and a quarter

which the towns and cities will have to match.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the effect of this amendment will bring the Bureau's appropriation back to what they had to operate with in the fiscal year 1951. You will notice that they requested \$234,600 more in fiscal 1952 than they had in fiscal 1951. This committee cut that request by about \$98,000. I think in things like this we have got to bear with the operations of the agency to some extent. The Ramspeck promotions, social-security taxes, and so forth, will amount to \$28,520. Bringing up to a full-year basis of the 14 new positions allowed them in 1951 will be another \$35,000. There is \$63,500 right there of the \$136,600 that we allowed them. If this amendment prevails, they would have to cut below the 1951 level.

Congress amended the Social Security Act in 1950 which meant that you were putting a greater work load on this particular agency by your action in voting for the liberalization of social security. As a consequence, they came in last year with a deficiency request, and as I recall, the Senate allowed them \$250,000 to hire additional help to perform the duties that this Congress said they should perform in connection with their work with the various States in carrying out this program. The House did not go along with that \$250,000 increase last year, but it was cut down to \$50,000, and only provided them 14 additional positions to work with these new amendments.

Here are some of the things they are up against. The Bureau will have approximately one and one-half positions to perform the various activities for each State program this coming year as they had for every two positions last year. In the past year, 1950, to accomplish the work of the liberalized amendments to the Social Security Act, the Bureau staff was required to work 2,900 hours of recorded overtime which they paid for during the period from July 1 to December 9, 1950, and an equivalent number of hours of unrecorded overtime performed by the top staff who received no overtime pay.

Mr. Chairman, this committee, ever since I have been on it, and the Senate has also done the same thing, has complimented the administration of this program. In 1950 Congress took action to liberalize the Social Security Act, which meant that they were putting on the shoulders of those people added responsibility they did not theretofore have.

If we are going to vote year after year to liberalize existing legislation, and to liberalize the benefits, I do not know how you are going to expect the agency to work with less than it had before. That is what this amendment will do.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. In the questions which the gentleman from Rhode Island asked in committee, and I compliment him on his examination of the witnesses, he elicited this answer:

We are estimating 4 percent less in 1952 on old-age assistance and 11 percent less on aid to dependent children.

It seems to me to follow from that that with a lower workload they should at least not have a greater appropriation.

Mr. FOGARTY. I was not talking about administrative expenses, as I remember, in that question. I was talking about the grants-to-States program under that \$1,300,000,000. We were trying to get down to that. We knew at the time of the administrative set-up, we know of the requests they made a year ago because we had liberalized social-security benefits and that they needed additional personnel. They could not get what they asked for and as a result their backlog was built up and up, and even though their request shows only an increase of 13 percent, the workload that has been put on them by Congress has increased by 30 percent. That fact is shown in the hearings.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEATING) there were—ayes 74, noes 62.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. KEATING.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 95, noes 78.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office of the Administrator, \$2,279,000, together with not to exceed \$403,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to finance the regional office activities of such constituent organizations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Page 31, line 6, after "Administrator", strike out "\$2,279,000" and insert "\$2,050,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, this is a very simple amendment. It cuts \$229,000 from the funds appropriated to the Office of the Administrator, Mr. Ewing. This cut I believe to be justified in view of the findings of the subcommittee which I had the privilege to head last year, whose duty it was to make a study of the utilization of personnel in the executive agencies.

There are very many reasons why this amount should be cut. Perhaps it should be cut more than my figure would cut it. In the Office of the Administrator we found the ratio of personnel employees to total employment to be 1 personnel employee to 20 employees in the Agency. In other words, it took 1 man to handle the personnel problems of 20 people in the Agency. It is my understanding that in private business the ratio of personnel employees to over-all employment runs far above 1 to 150. There is no reason why Government personnel offices should not at least approach that ratio.

I may say also that we uncovered a report of the Federal Security Agency, embodied in the appendix of our report, which was startling. It shows that Mr. Ewing and Mr. Altmeyer spent thousands of Government dollars in visiting England and other countries where socialized medicine is practiced. Mr. Altmeyer even went to New Zealand. They came back and made a very elaborate report. If you will read that report you will find that it is most pointedly in favor of a program of socialized medicine here, and is nothing more or less than Socialist propaganda.

I do not believe there is any doubt but that here is one place where we can save for the taxpayers. I may say further it is my understanding that out of the appropriations to the Office of the Administrator are taken these so-called slush funds with which these \$50-a-day consultants are hired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think the gentleman's amendment is in order, and I want to commend him on the splendid service he rendered as chairman of the subcommittee during the last year investigating the expenditures of this agency. In view of the report that was made as a result of the diligent effort of the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of that committee, I think his amendment is in order and should be approved.

In my judgment, that agency last year and the year before spent a great deal more funds than were absolutely necessary. This is a case where they can save a part of the funds that have been allocated to them and still do a better job. I think the gentleman will recall the hearings held by the committee disclose that in many instances they could have done much better work if they had not had quite so many employees in their service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think the gentleman from Kansas, whose efforts contributed so materially to the success of our committee last year. I do not think there is any need to discuss this amendment further. The mere fact that it takes funds out of the office of Mr. Ewing, I think, makes it in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is again an instance where another committee has been investigating some of the various agencies and has not brought it to the specific attention of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I might say to the gentleman that copies of all of our reports were sent to each member of the Committee on Appropriations individually at the beginning of the Eighty-second Congress and also were provided to employees of the committee.

Mr. FOGARTY. The only thing I can say about that is that many Members of Congress probably do not read all reports that are sent to them and perhaps they went into the wastepaper basket like some other things do. I think such matters should be brought to their attention specifically and should be brought especially to the attention of the subcommittee handling the appropriations involved, and we would look into these things.

Mr. Chairman, I know it is a very popular thing to call Oscar Ewing all the names under the sun and it is nothing new for this so-called Williams committee to be accusing Oscar Ewing of promoting socialized medicine, but before the Williams committee was ever formed, the subcommittee on appropriations that had been appropriating funds since Oscar Ewing has been Federal Security Administrator has been doing its job in the proper way and there is not a committee in this House that has been as tough on Oscar Ewing's appropriation as this subcommittee has been.

Every year they have cut his appropriation rather severely and it was at the suggestion of this very same committee 4 years ago when GEORGE SCHWABE was on the committee, when the Republicans had control, and when Frank Keefe was the chairman of the committee, that they reorganized the top level of the Federal Security Agency. I said on the floor, at that time, that I did not think it was a good thing to do. A year later, I had to admit in all sincerity and honesty that it was a good thing the way it worked out. They saved money. They saved a great deal of money and eliminated many positions. This year we cut them again. We cut them \$150,000 under the estimate, which is also a cut below what they had for 1951. It is not only a cut below the estimate, but a cut below what he had in 1951. If you go back to 1951 you will see his agency was also hit hard last year in our report and in our appropriation bill.

What are we doing with an amendment like this? You have field offices all over the country. Is there any breakdown of this pending \$229,000 de-

crease? Not a bit. That is the type of legislation you are getting here. When Members offer amendments they do not know just what part of the service will come under it. Is this \$229,000 to be a cut only on the field offices? If you vote for this amendment, he can apply it there. He can make a cut against every field office throughout the country and not touch his own. But we in the committee, if you will read the committee report, provided that none of the committee cut shall be applied to any regional office. We want those regional offices kept intact, and we applied the cut against his own specific offices here in Washington. That is the reasonable way to do it, if you want to make cuts in Federal expenditures. You should find out where the cuts should be made and demand that they be made in those particular places.

We say in our report:

Activities embraced include general executive direction, program coordination, field services, including management and house-keeping costs in agency regional offices—

Which takes in every regional office in the country, and—

publications and reports, and administrative services at the agency level.

But we spelled out in our report exactly where we wanted the cut made.

He wanted two additional positions for program coordination and development. He wanted them a year ago, but we did not give them to him. He wanted them this year and we refused to give them to him.

We say further in this report:

For the past 2 years the committee has denied increases for this on the basis that it saw no justification for enlarging the staff, and there is essentially nothing new in the picture at this point. The cut is also directed at the items for general administration and direction, publications and reports, the merit system staff, and administrative services.

That comes under his immediate offices.

These groups can stand a cut without impairing essential staff and services at these levels, provided the most effective use is made of the staff and all nonessentials are dispensed with.

Now, this committee, on its own initiative, under Republican administration in the Eightieth Congress, took the initial step to reorganize this agency. They saved the taxpayers considerable sums, and they did it in a scientific way. They knew what they were doing. I disagreed with them at that time, but I had to subsequently admit they were right. We have given this thing thorough consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. On page 19 of the committee's report you very emphatically state that the Federal Security Agency is not a defense agency.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is there any reason why Mr. Ewing cannot tighten his belt along with the rest of the American public?

Mr. FOGARTY. When we cut him a year ago—if you will go back and see what we cut him in 1951—you will notice that in the past 3 or 4 years he has been cut every year. Our bill for 1952 cuts him below what he had in 1951. If you will go over every other agency and do what we have done in this one, you will get real economy and get it in an intelligent way, but not the way you propose to do it in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi) there were—ayes 101, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Administrator, including salaries for the Division of Service Operations; and purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; \$711,500, together with not to exceed \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to cover the charges for services, supplies, equipment, and materials furnished.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, while we are considering appropriations for these various agencies I should like to say that on the news ticker in the speakers lobby is shown the statement of the Treasury of the United States at this period. In it there is an item which interests me greatly, and I cannot find any explanation for it; perhaps the appropriate committee of the House can. It shows that on the 17th day of April 1950, the gold supply of the United States, I suppose that means in Fort Knox and the Federal Reserve bank, was \$24,246,684,051.28; and this year on the 16th of April, a year later, it is \$21,806,609,160.71. That shows a drop in the gold stocks of the United States of \$2,440,074,890.57 in 1 year.

I would like to know where that gold has gone and why. You and I all know that the world price of gold in terms of our paper dollars or credits is far higher than the official valuation we place on it here in the United States; I think a fair average is on the order of \$57 an ounce throughout the rest of the world, while our price is \$35 an ounce. If you took \$2,440,000,000 worth of gold which is about 2,400 tons of gold, and sold it in foreign markets for what you could get for it you would make about a 60 percent profit on it, and that profit I figure would be about \$1,450,000,000. Now, while we are talking about cutting appropriations by \$110,000 or something of that sort in order to save some of the taxpayers' money, perhaps we ought to find out what has happened to this two-billion-odd dollars worth of gold that was in Fort Knox last year and is not there now.

I suggest that the appropriate committees of this House make inquiry—perhaps it is all right, but it is not in the United States Government Treasury and I know it is in none of your pockets, because it is against the law for you to have it. The only place I can think of that it might have gone is abroad; and you do not ship 2,000 tons of gold abroad without somebody finding out about it. That is a lot of gold; that is one-tenth of our entire stock; that is one-fourth of a 10,000-ton shipload. Somebody ought to know where it is. Has it been transferred to foreign governments? And, if so, to what governments? If it has been paid out to private foreign companies for the purpose of purchasing strategic materials, at what price was it used to pay for the strategic materials? If that price was \$35 an ounce, then, of course, they have a 60-percent profit on our gold in the foreign market and that is a sweet profit.

It seems to me that as this gold is supposed to be backing up some of this "lettuce," as they call it, that floats around the United States, the green paper money that you carry around in your pocket, I would like to know where 10 percent of the gold backing of the United States paper dollar has gone. If memory serves me correctly, just prior to the war we had something like \$27,000,000,000 worth of gold at Fort Knox, \$26,000,000,000, some odd hundreds of millions, I cannot recall the exact amount; but now it is down to twenty-one billions. How much farther will it go? How far can it go? Will the Committee on Banking and Currency tell us, for example, without causing us concern in reference to backing of the Federal Reserve notes?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The thought has not just occurred to me, but a lot of this \$2,500,000,000 of gold has gone abroad because foreign nations are now beginning to demand gold in payment for their bills of exchange, and so forth. We can expect that flow of gold to continue out.

Mr. HINSHAW. What right have they got to it when Americans cannot have it? That is what I would like to know. I suggest that the appropriate committees of the Congress find out what is going on. If it is all right, that is satisfactory with me, I, then, have no criticism to make here, but I would like to know where it is going and why.

The Clerk read as follows:

Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of subsections-203 (j) and (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal excess property for educational purposes and protection of public health, \$300,000.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 32, line 10, strike out "\$300,000." and

insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$50,000: *Provided*, That \$40,000 of such amount shall be available to the Commissioner of Education to carry out the above-specified provisions of law with respect to disposal of excess property for educational purposes and \$10,000 of such amount shall be available to the Surgeon General to carry out the above-specified provisions of law with respect to disposal of excess property for protection of public health."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I may say I think the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. NORRELL: On page 32, line 10, strike out "\$300,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000."

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, if adopted, will reduce the amount of our appropriation for the next fiscal year from \$300,000 to \$100,000. This is an activity that was created shortly after World War II for disposal of the surplus property of the armed services. I think a reasonably good job has been done. I am not here to criticize, but the job has been done. The work is over. They have a skeleton force that needs employment. I am not even trying to get these men discharged. But they are doing but little, if anything, where they are presently employed and if my amendment is adopted all they will have to do is to get transferred to some other branch of the Government having important work to be done, possibly at an increase in salary, and go their way. Nobody will suffer. They can then make a useful contribution, possibly in the war effort. We are all trying to save money. This is a great subcommittee, and I trust that the Chairman will not oppose reducing this amount from \$300,000 to \$100,000. The work has been done. Last year the budget estimate was \$333,300. This great subcommittee allowed every nickel they asked. This year they made some progress. The Bureau, instead of asking for exactly what they had last year or during the current year, made a request for \$333,000. They saved \$33,000 somewhere, and I commend them for that. This committee has allowed them \$300,000 for the next fiscal year. The war has been over a long time. Many of us believe we are right on the brink of world war III. Is it not about time that we got rid of the organization that was set up to dispose of the surplus property from World War II? This amendment ought to be adopted and really and truly the entire amount ought to be dispensed with. However, we can permit this agency to continue until July 1, 1951, on this present appropriation and then allow them \$100,000 under my amendment, and then permit

the agency to be discontinued on and after July 1, 1952.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to disagree with my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL], but I do not believe his figures are correct. It is true that this surplus property disposal unit was set up to dispose of surplus property including that from the last war. He said we did not cut them any a year ago. We cut them from \$358,000 to \$333,000 a year ago. This year we cut them 10 percent, which is not a very big reduction in a small unit like this, and we allow \$300,000 to run this unit for the next fiscal year. In this fiscal year they expect to collect over \$350,000 in income from this operation, which is turned into the Treasury. In other words they will show a profit for the Federal Treasury of \$50,000 or more because their appropriation is less than the income. If you eliminate this program today you are going to hit every institution in every State of the Union that gets the advantage of the surplus. They have all obtained some surplus property from these defense and other Federal sources, both personal and real estate, and this organization has done it. They have also given assistance to health units throughout the country. In the past 5 years about \$1,200,000,000 has been transferred to educational and public health institutions. Property which cost the Government approximately \$65,000,000 has been recaptured in the past 7 or 8 months by this particular organization, and if it had not been for this organization, may I say to the gentleman from Arkansas, it would have cost the Federal Government huge sums to build or acquire the facilities that they have recaptured through the recapture clause that they have in every transfer contract that they let in every community throughout the country. This is operating under the emergency program we are in at the present time. The committee recommended a 10 percent cut. In view of the facts before us, if you are going to cut this you are perhaps going to hit every county in Arkansas. There is probably not a county in Arkansas that has not benefited by this particular program. I think Arkansas alone has received at least \$29,444,000 worth of surplus property at no cost to them at all, and all the educational institutions in the country have received help from this particular program, and they are still receiving help. There was some freeze put on this material last fall or last summer, but it now again is flowing into the local educational institutions and public health centers all over the country at no cost to them. If it had been put on the market like these things that the Bonner

Committee is turning up, it would have caused a furor such as you probably never before heard. But, this has been one of the best run programs. It has been beneficial to the Federal Government; it has been beneficial to every community in this country that has taken advantage of it.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. I said the Bureau had done a good job, but I also said I thought the work had been done. I read the gentleman's report and I read the questions asked by the gentleman from Rhode Island as well as those asked by the gentleman from West Virginia. The report shows that the job has been done. If my amendment is adopted, they will have this year's money to operate on until July 1. My amendment would not abolish them but would simply take two-thirds of the money away from them and look forward, maybe, to winding up the business another year.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think if we want to lay the cards on the table the gentleman's amendment should be to wipe out the entire agency as of July 1, because there is no need of giving them one-third of what they need to operate with. They cannot operate efficiently, and it will be a cost to the Federal Government and a cost to every taxpayer if you go through with this type of proposition. They just cannot operate efficiently on \$100,000.

Let us lay the cards on the table. If you do not want this agency to exist any longer, if you do not think there is need for it, if you do not think the educational people in every State of the Union are for it, you have another think coming. Let us lay the cards on the table. Let us either take it all out or give them enough to operate on efficiently.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. NORRELL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GATHINGS) there were—ayes 104, noes 74.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. DOYLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday when I spoke briefly with reference to the matter of vocational education and distributive occupations I did not have before me a very valuable report from the department of education of my native State of California, dated June 30, 1950. That booklet has been placed in my hands in the last hour, and I feel the House ought to have some of the important figures therein contained. I am sure the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD should contain them. I realize we have now passed that place in the bill where an amendment is possible, but I am sure you would want this valuable information, and that it will help correct misapprehensions present. I am also sure that if the Committee of the Whole had had this information earlier in the day

it might well have favorably considered an amendment reincorporating this subject of distributive education with modifications as to some items which might be stricken. This report which I have is signed by Roy Simpson, superintendent of public construction of the State of California. It shows that in the State of California, and I take it in most States, this program which is being now eliminated under the terms of this bill as it now stands was instituted in 1937 in 31 communities in California, and then had 5,306 part-time classes, and, from 1937 until this date, 1950, the number of communities participating in this grant program, in which the States bear half and the Federal Government half, has increased to 129 cities. The number of students in this program, just in one State alone, in California, is over 60,000, as of June 1950.

The State of California Legislature the other day passed a resolution against deleting this amount in this bill, I am just informed.

Another important item of information which we should have in this Committee is this: That in 1937, when the program was first instituted in California, there were only 93 classes. Last June, in the State of California alone, there were 1,123 classes, and there were part-time instructors numbering 489.

On yesterday I called your attention to the fact that two important telegrams were received by me. I wish to reemphasize those telegrams and call your attention to the one sent to me by Mr. Hollingsworth, head of the vocational department of our Long Beach city schools, which contains this language:

SAN LUIS OBISPO, CALIF., April 16, 1951.
Congressman CLYDE DOYLE,
House of Representatives:

Just learned that \$10,000,000 was restored to the budget bill for vocational education, but \$1,500,000 was deducted for the purpose of abolishing distributive education program. Understand appropriation bill will be heard on the floor of the House of Representatives Tuesday, April 17. By abolishing this valuable program at this time it will deprive 129 school departments and 60,000 students of the training and distributive education. Hope you can do something on behalf this fine program.

JULIAN A. MCPHEE,
President, California State Polytechnic College.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., April 16, 1951.
Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress, House Office Building, Washington:

Knowing your interest in education following is sent as a guide. Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill to be voted upon Tuesday April 17. Bill omits inclusion of distributive education. Douglas Newcomb, school superintendent, Long Beach Sales Executive Club and Retailers Associated urge reinstatement of distributive education as training field continued through past world war merchants prices fixed. Losing experienced salesmen to war plants. Decreased efficiency increases cost prices and damages public morale. Trained replacements needed. Federal money matched by State.

J. E. HOLLINGSWORTH.

The minute I saw that telegram, with the Long Beach Sales Executive Club and Retailers Associated of the city of

Long Beach referred to, I realized that they speak for heavy taxpayers in my city and State. I also knew full well, because I know many of those executives, that when that telegram came to me from those groups, that they would not ask me to support any program which was not recognized by them, being heavy taxpayers, as a very, very valuable program. The telegram included approval from heavy tax-paying groups.

I have here a letter from the department of education, commission for vocational education of the State of California. I had the pleasure of serving on the State board of education of the State of California for a couple of years and at that time, in some small way at least, the value of this distributive education in my State came to my personal attention and just now Mr. Smith, the State director of vocational education, has communicated to me, and he says in his letter, just arrived:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION,
COMMISSION FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
Sacramento, April 16, 1951.
The Honorable CLYDE DOYLE,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DOYLE: We have just learned that the House Appropriations Committee has recommended \$18,223,261 for the George Barden vocational education fund. This amount reflects a 100-percent elimination of financial assistance for distributive education. The amounts for trade and industrial, agricultural, and homemaking aspects of the total vocational education program have been restored.

This letter has as its purpose to protest this highly discriminatory action. To single out distributive education for complete elimination just doesn't make sense, especially in these days when the total manpower, not merely the production phases only, must be at the highest possible point of efficiency.

In California we are serving 129 communities this year in a program which has been a vital and integral part of our public-school system for almost 15 years.

While we all recognize the utmost importance of eliminating excessive Federal expenditures, elimination of the \$1,500,000 involved in this national program seems to be completely false economy. This is especially true when the result would be to deprive one segment of our working population of its right to learn, to enter, and to advance in an occupation.

The legislature of this State has adopted a resolution protesting such action. The public schools and the entire distributive phase of our economy appeal to you and your California colleagues to prevent such action.

We wish there was more time in order to make you completely aware of the emergency nature of this matter. The report was made public by the Appropriations Committee on Friday, April 13, and we understand the House of Representatives may take action on the matter on Tuesday, April 17.

We will appreciate any assistance you may see fit to render in securing restoration of the funds for distributive education.

WESLEY P. SMITH,
State Director of Vocational Education.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote from the 1950 report of the State of California Board for vocational education a few statements and figures.

It may be that some of the items which the distinguished subcommittee

recommended should be eliminated during these days when we must only pay for the most essential. But gentlemen, that is no justification for so suddenly slaughtering all the program.

From the said report, I read:

PREFACE

The past year in distributive education in California included among its many achievements substantial increases in enrollments, communities served, classes offered, and the number of business specialists who served as instructors. The report of the year is presented in this bulletin of the Bureau of Business Education. It provides a splendid example of what can be accomplished when educational agencies, business, labor, and civic groups work together.

In the coming year, attention will need to be centered on the ways in which distributive education can assist in the war economy. The lessons learned a few years ago in a similar situation will be of value. Distributive educators will find many opportunities for gearing their programs to the changing conditions and needs of business in the days that lie ahead.

ROY E. SIMPSON,
Superintendent of Public Instruction and Executive Officer, State Board for Vocational Education.

THE MANPOWER SITUATION

The present appears to be a period of adjustment—and it is a little too early to foresee the extent of the shift to military activities, particularly as it creates shortages of workers in business occupations. Judging from the previous war situation, employees of distributive organizations will be drawn into war employment. In many instances their jobs may be covered by the remaining force. In other cases, new personnel will be required.

A major factor in this problem and one not possible to forecast accurately is whether large-scale war is imminent. It may be that we are faced with a prolonged period of tension without large-scale war.

RETAILERS COOPERATE

An important development of recent days is the organization of the retailers of the United States as a first line of defense against the inflationary pressures inherent in the national rearmament program. Representatives of every branch of the retail industry at a recent meeting in Washington, D. C., formed a special retail industry committee to cooperate with the Federal Government in planning for future regulations and possible controls.

The objectives of the committee include the following: "American retailers are united in their awareness of the inflation hazard of the present emergency. We have pledged our opposition to any force which might accelerate the upward price spiral. It is a further objective of the retail industry committee to establish a liaison relationship with Government so that the retail industry may effectively plan a constructive part in national planning for whatever emergency may occur."

IMPLICATIONS FOR DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

The flexibility and resourcefulness of distributive education are certain to be called upon increasingly as the change from peacetime to a wartime economy develops. There will be need for training of replacement workers in all fields of distributive activity; for supervisory training courses; for institutes and clinics to bring information and help to businessmen in business operation during controls and shortages, if these eventuate; for continuing courses that are essential to every program including food handling and sanitation, salesmanship and customer relations, human relations training, and others; to list only a few responsibilities.

Cooperative classes will be an increasingly important means of helping businessmen meet the needs for wartime personnel.

TABLE I.—Communities served by distributive education in California and enrollments by years 1937–50

Years	Communities	Enrollments	
		Evening and part time	Cooperative part time
1937–38	31	5,306	93
1938–39	33	15,651	198
1939–40	61	17,350	268
1940–41	57	22,265	389
1941–42	72	25,952	236
1942–43	123	28,403	134
1943–44	60	14,903	124
1944–45	36	12,063	214
1945–46	43	21,792	237
1946–47	54	23,248	618
1947–48	65	37,578	875
1948–49	82	38,147	1,155
1949–50	129	59,292	

TABLE II.—Distributive education courses and instructors in California by years, 1937–50

Years	Classes	Instructors
1937–38	93	45
1938–39	400	147
1939–40	399	160
1940–41	540	208
1941–42	600	256
1942–43	669	107
1943–44	515	107
1944–45	439	92
1945–46	565	252
1946–47	678	244
1947–48	770	286
1948–49	813	406
1949–50	1,123	489

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, the Nation owes a debt of gratitude for the fine work accomplished by the Senate Crime Committee headed by our colleague in the Senate, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER. The evidence unearthed by the committee reveals the existence of organized inter-state crime conditions in excess of anything we had imagined. There is certainly ample evidence of the need for appropriate Federal legislation in this field, and the need for new legislation to stop the organized activities of these gangsters.

In my opinion, if we are to gain the fruits of the work done by Senator KEFAUVER and his committee, we should establish a joint House-Senate watchdog committee. The watchdog committee would have two principal functions: First, to keep a careful check on the various Federal agencies charged with the responsibility of enforcement of Federal laws. Secondly, the watchdog committee could investigate from time to time serious crime activities over which the Federal Government would have jurisdiction.

To work in conjunction with the watchdog committee an independent crime commission should be established, made up of outstanding citizens. The crime commission could work with various State and local crime committees

in order to maintain a continuing surveillance of large scale criminal activities in the various States. Under my proposal, the crime commission could report directly to the watchdog committee from time to time.

In the past, much of the great good accomplished by special investigative committees of both the House and Senate has been lost by the failure of Congress to follow through on the original investigations. The establishment of a joint House-Senate watchdog committee will give assurance to the country that the Congress will not repeat the tragic errors made in the past. It will be notice to the underworld that this is not just another investigation, but the beginning of a real and sustained effort by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States to eliminate organized gangsterism and organized criminal syndicates in the United States. My early experience as State prosecutor taught me that it takes more than half-way measures to eliminate crime.

A joint committee will be more effective than a single committee, because the House of Representatives has original jurisdiction in many of the problems relating to crime. For example, all questions dealing with tax problems must originate in the House of Representatives under the Constitution. This is likewise true of other questions that arise in connection with violation of Federal law.

It is my intention to join with Senator KEFAUVER in supporting the establishment of a joint watchdog committee. Having followed the work of Chairman KEFAUVER's committee and the recommendations that he has made, I know that the suggestions I have made are in accordance with his views.

I will within a few days introduce in the House a concurrent resolution to provide for an effective Senate-House watchdog committee.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to my able colleague from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. I would like to commend him on it. I hope the House will follow through on his splendid suggestion. I would like to tell the gentleman that a subcommittee of the Committee on Ways and Means has been working on one of the subsidiary problems that the gentleman mentioned; namely, the narcotics trade in the United States. We have discovered far-reaching implications in this trade.

I am also happy to tell the gentleman that we have recommended legislation, which will soon be reported to this body for action. I commend the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I want to commend the gentleman from Louisiana for the efforts that he has made and the leadership he has provided in his committee to bring out the necessary legislation. He has hit at something very important, and that is the necessity for a joint committee of the House and Senate, because in many cases the House has original jurisdiction in matters relating to criminal activities. In other

words, the whole question of tax violation is a matter of original jurisdiction in the House, and that is why we need a joint committee.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. If the gentleman will yield further, there is also the question of overlapping jurisdiction on the part of different committees, and I think that would be one of the real achievements of the gentleman's proposal.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman very much. The gentleman is right.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I want to commend the gentleman on his very fine statement. I would like to call attention to the fact that 3 or 4 years ago we organized a crime commission in California, and Governor Warren appointed ex-Admiral Stanley as head of it. He pointed out in his report that crime was interstate and that you could not define it to any one territory; that you must have some interstate legislation in order to reach the underworld effectively. I think the scheme you have proposed will do that.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I thank the gentleman. I think the evidence unearthed by the Kefauver committee has proved beyond doubt the existence of an interstate crime syndicate on a scale that most of us had not imagined at all.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. I was interested in the statement of the gentleman from California on the interstate interest in the problem that the gentleman has presented to the House. As one member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I would like to advise you that our committee has been interested in the problems which the gentleman mentioned, and would like to recall to his attention the fact that this committee did report out a bill on the slot-machine syndicate only in the last Congress.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. That is correct, and that simply confirms the need for joint House and Senate action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] has expired.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in answer to the inquiry made by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] concerning the gold reserve in the United States, I would like to read a letter I received from Mr. Kenneth A. Kenyon, Assistant Secretary, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D. C. It reads:

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE
FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, August 21, 1950.

Hon. BOYD TACKETT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TACKETT: We have received your letter of August 14 and the attached com-

munication from your constituent, Mrs. J. M. Damon, inquiring about the recent decline in the gold stock of the United States.

The decline in the United States gold stock, which has been taking place during the past year, is not cause for alarm. On the contrary, it is an indication of the readjustment which is taking place in the monetary reserves of foreign countries. The United States has recently been selling gold for dollars to foreign countries which are in the process of rebuilding their reserves. Monetary reserves (in gold and foreign currencies) are maintained by all countries that engage in international trade. Their functions are similar to the functions of balances in individual checking accounts: (1) They facilitate the settlement of debts incurred in the normal exchange of goods between different countries and (2) they provide a reserve of funds which can be drawn upon in case of emergency.

During the first few years after the war, many foreign countries had to sell large amounts of gold from their reserves in order to obtain dollars with which to buy urgently needed goods in the United States. Consequently, between the end of 1945 and August 1949, over 4½ billion dollars (\$4,543,000,000) worth of gold was added to our gold stock. By selling so much gold to us, many foreign countries reduced their stocks of gold to dangerously low levels; they had little left with which to carry on trade with us and to meet unforeseen emergency situations.

During the past year, however, as a result of increased production and currency devaluations, many countries succeeded in increasing their sales of goods to the United States. Some of these countries are using a portion of their dollar earnings to buy back from us some of the gold that was sold during the postwar period of reconstruction.

The amounts involved in these recent purchases by foreign countries are small relative to our total gold stock, which remains well above the legal-reserve requirements stipulated by Congress. Furthermore, the United States stock of gold represents about 70 percent of total reported world gold reserves (outside of the Soviet Union).

We trust that this information will serve to answer the questions raised by your constituent, whose letter to you is returned herewith.

Very truly yours,

KENNETH A. KENYON,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Was that gold sold at \$35 an ounce?

Mr. TACKETT. I have just given the information that I received from the Federal Reserve System. I do not know, of course, what the gold was sold for or what we paid for it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does the gentleman know whether any of those foreign countries have turned around and resold the gold for dollars at about \$57 an ounce and made a 60-percent profit on the turn-over?

Mr. TACKETT. Of course, I do not know whether or not they are making a profit on the gold or whether we made a profit when we bought the gold.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman mentioned the question of a reserve; did he say coal or gold?

Mr. TACKETT. Gold.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Was there any statement attached to that letter from the

Treasury stating the countries that received the gold?

Mr. TACKETT. No; there is not.

Mr. HINSHAW. I would be very much interested in knowing who got it.

Mr. TACKETT. I am sure that the gentleman or anyone else can get this information by writing to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States or the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TACKETT. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. There is one other way, sir, in which it can be acquired. If we furnish dollars or dollar equivalents through contributions to ECA or otherwise and they use that same contribution of our money to buy our gold stocks; can they not do it that way, too?

Mr. TACKETT. I am sure that they could.

Mr. MASON. They have been.

Mr. TACKETT. Yes, that could have happened—I don't know whether any of the gold was so acquired by foreign countries from our reserve.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word simply for the purpose of saying that we are reaching the end of the bill. We have three more titles to read. I understand there are two or three amendments to be offered. I am sure that if we confine our remarks to the pending bill, it would expedite consideration of the remaining sections and we will make much better time.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$8,300,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060).

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 34, line 3, strike out "\$8,300,000" and insert "\$8,000,000."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is proposed in order to cut the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board from the figure set forth in the bill of \$8,300,000 to \$8,000,000, resulting in a saving of \$300,000.

The justification for this is as follows: If you will look at the schedule in back of the bill it appears there that the Labor Board has been cut from its last year's appropriation, but if you will look on

page 20 of the report you will find that although there is an apparent cut the fact is the rental of the National Labor Relations Board has been transferred from that Board to the General Services Administration which saves them \$353,000 a year. The net result is that this Board's personnel requirements has increased by nearly \$100,000 rather than the reduction which appears in the schedule in back of the report.

In addition to that fact, Mr. Chairman, an incident has occurred since this report was made which further justifies the cut in the personnel of the National Labor Relations Board. You will recall that in the last war we had what was known as the War Labor Board. That Board at that time settled a great many of the labor disputes. That Board was given jurisdiction by Executive order. Now, there has been going on a dispute between industry and labor in the last few weeks and this morning's paper announces that this new War Labor Board which has been created by Executive order will during this emergency have jurisdiction over labor disputes. So that since this bill was reported much of the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board has been taken away by this Executive order.

The history of the situation is that in the last war when the War Labor Board was set up and began to take jurisdiction over labor disputes, the work of the National Labor Relations Board in dispute cases, which is the larger proportion of their business, was tremendously reduced, so that there is no occasion in the world why they should have an increase in view of the recent decision which occurred only this morning giving to the War Labor Board the power to settle labor disputes during the present emergency.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if the gentleman by what he has just said of the new War Labor Board is approving the assumption of such activities by the Board? As far as I am concerned, I would rather we proceed under the laws we have and the procedures that have been created by the Congress.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I think it is a very sad commentary on the Congress and on the country when an act of Congress by which we undertake to settle labor disputes or to settle any other proposition is passed by the Congress and becomes the law of the land, and the President of the United States undertakes to do something else about it by Executive order. And I make that statement without respect to who may be President of the United States. This Congress is supposed to make the laws and not the Executive.

I protested during the last war against this extra jurisdiction being assumed by the executive department to settle labor disputes when we had a Labor Act to do it with, and I protest again, but the protest is not going to do you any good. The fact is that during this present emergency labor disputes are going

to be handled in very large measure by the executive department under this new War Labor Board and the work of the National Labor Relations Board, which was set up by the Congress, is going to be diminished.

Now, I do not want to get off the track. What I am trying to do is to save the taxpayers of the United States \$300,000 of unnecessary expenditures. I am asking the House to vote to sustain this amendment and cut that appropriation back to the point of what may be needed.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the gentleman's argument is well taken on the basis of his assumption. However, might I suggest in respect to his references to the responsibility of the Congress, that possibly the Congress ought to look into the matter that is presently developing and see just what the Congress might do about it.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman from Indiana knows that he will have no more ardent advocate of that program than the present speaker now addressing you. I shall be glad to join with the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted during the Eightieth Congress under Republican control. That is one of the things that they take credit for during their regime when they had control of both the House and the Senate. On a personal basis I bitterly opposed the passage of that act. I am still opposed to it, and I remember very well when the act was passed and when the first request for an appropriation came before this subcommittee some 3 or 4 years ago. They did not have anything to justify their appropriation at all under the new act, but we gave them every dime they asked for. I remember the argument used then was "this is our baby and we have to give them every dime they ask for because we do not want to be blamed for this act if we do not give them enough to operate with." I went along with the majority at that time, who were Republicans, and because of wanting to be fair in this entire proceeding I have never willfully, in one way or another, attempted to cut this appropriation just because I was against the enactment of this legislation. As a consequence, for the past 3 years since I have been Chairman of this subcommittee we have not purposely cut it one dime just because some of us had been opposed to and voted against the enactment of this act when it was passed 4 years ago. On the contrary we have gone along with them.

They came before us and they gave us the workloads they are working under; they gave us the backlog of the number of cases they are behind, and they established such a case that we have practically given them every dime they have asked for in order to carry out the provisions of that act. They testified this year that in 1951 the estimated cases to be processed were 22,950. In 1952 they show an increase up to 23,600. On the record of case intake for the fiscal year 1950 it was 21,632 and 1951 it is 22,950. So, all the figures that they have given us show that their increase in workload is going up year after year, and that is why we did not cut them as much as we have some other agencies, although we did cut them \$282,500 this year to bring them in line so that they could operate on the fiscal year 1951 basis. I just wanted to make this one thing clear to you, even though the majority of this subcommittee has been against that act since it was enacted, we have never deliberately attempted to slice one dollar from it, so that we could never be blamed. The act is on the books. It was an act of Congress. It was put on by a majority vote of the Eightieth Congress, and they should have the money to operate with, and we have been fair with them in their appropriation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. NELSON. Can the gentleman tell me where this new board created by Executive order will get its money to operate?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot tell the gentleman that. We have nothing to do with it. It is not in this bill. There is nothing in this bill that pertains to that board at all. We have absolutely nothing to do with it. It will come under some defense appropriations subcommittee in the House, I would assume.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Would this War Labor Board that has been created handle the rank-and-file cases of the type that are now before the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is something I do not know. This new Board has just been established. I do not know what its duties are. I do not know whether they are going to get money to function with or not. I do not know whether they are going to need money. I do not know whether they are going to be paid or not. That is something I do not know. I do not think the Congress knows. It has not been before our committee, and I do not believe it has been before any other committee on appropriations, to my knowledge; so I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. So cutting the appropriation then would be just taking a shot in the dark and hoping there would be an agency now set up that would take over the work that is being done by the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot give the gentleman an answer to that at this moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Cox) there were—ayes 116, noes 60.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as may be specifically authorized annually in appropriation acts, there is hereby appropriated for crediting monthly to the railroad retirement account for the fiscal year 1952, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to the amount covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during each such fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (26 U. S. C. 1500-1538): *Provided*, That the appropriation made herein for the fiscal year 1952 shall be adjusted by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, in such manner as may be necessary to insure that the railroad retirement account shall be credited for an amount equal to the amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) prior to July 1, 1951, under said Railroad Retirement Tax Act and under the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended, less (1) amounts credited as premiums to the railroad retirement account (excluding \$334,429,100 heretofore appropriated for military service credits) and (2) amounts properly chargeable as administrative expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board, prior to July 1, 1951.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 36, the proviso beginning after the colon on line 4 and going down to the period on line 16. This is legislation on an appropriation bill. Obviously, this goes beyond the scope of the bill and beyond the appropriation provisions of the bill. It is similar in nature to the language to which I made objection last year at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania define the specific language in the bill to which he raises the point of order?

Mr. FLOOD. The point of order is to the legislative intent and the legislative provision of the entire proviso.

As I read this, I construe in effect as amounting to a repealer of existing legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand that the gentleman makes a point of order only to the language on page 36 beginning at line 4, that is under the proviso?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. And ending on line 16?

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HARRIS. Would not the point of order raised by the gentleman go to the entire paragraph?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania so made the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD. There is no reason for that. My purpose is served since the point of order has been conceded, and I make it only to the proviso.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Do I understand that the point of order has been made only with respect to the language commencing on line 14 of page 36 and continuing to the end of line 16?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the way the Chair understands the point of order made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WOLVERTON. It is my understanding that the point of order goes to the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to make such a point of order?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. CROSSER. The point of order goes to the entire paragraph.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania a moment ago if his point of order was to the proviso only and I understand the gentleman to say that it was.

Mr. FLOOD. That was true. That was the point of order I made, but I have no objection to making a subsequent point of order this time to make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, so that there may be no misunderstanding about the situation, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York concede the point of order to the entire paragraph?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the entire paragraph, in view of the discussion which has just taken place.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order and offer an amendment, which I sent to the clerk's desk.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, where does the point of order now end? Does it end on line 16? I am confused. I do not know where the language ends to which the point of order is made. Does it end on line 16 or does it end on line 24 of page 36?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order now takes in the entire paragraph beginning on page 35 and ending at line 16, page 36, as follows:

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death

benefits in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as may be specifically authorized annually in appropriation acts, there is hereby appropriated for crediting monthly to the railroad retirement account for the fiscal year 1952, and for each fiscal year thereafter, an amount equal to the amount covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during each such fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (26 U. S. C. 1500-1538): *Provided*, That the appropriation made herein for the fiscal year 1952 shall be adjusted by the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, in such manner as may be necessary to insure that the railroad retirement account shall be credited for an amount equal to the amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) prior to July 1, 1951, under said Railroad Retirement Tax Act and under the Carriers Taxing Act of 1937, as amended, less (1) amounts credited as premiums to the railroad retirement account (excluding \$334,429,100 heretofore appropriated for military service credits) and (2) amounts properly chargeable as administrative expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board, prior to July 1, 1951.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. And the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] concedes the point of order. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McGRATH: On page 35, after line 14, insert the following: "Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits, in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as specifically provided for under this title, for crediting to the railroad retirement account, an amount equal to amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during the current fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (26 U. S. C. 1500-1538)."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, reducing this proposed amendment to its simplest terms, it is simply a method by which we hope to save \$4,500,000 of the taxpayers' money. Heretofore the procedure had been that at the beginning of the fiscal year they would approximate the amount which would be collected in taxes and then appropriate that amount. The new language provides that the taxes, as they are collected, will be turned over from the Treasury of the United States to the Railroad Retirement Board for immediate investment and for the payment of necessary benefits. The present system has been somewhat of a guess; a sort of put-and-take proposition, as we stated in the committee report. The proposed language changes it to monthly payments as the taxes are collected, the same as we have in our social-security program. The purpose of this would be to save the taxpayers the interest on the amount, and to set this up on a sound basis, and it means a saving of \$4,500,000.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGRATH. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CROSSER. The fact is you are changing the law as it now exists in that respect.

Mr. McGRATH. No. I will say to the gentleman that is not the fact.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRATH] has expired.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CROSSER offers the following amendment in substitution for the amendment offered by Mr. McGRATH, line 15 on page 35:

"Railroad retirement account: For an amount sufficient as an annual premium for the payments required under the Railroad Retirement Acts of August 29, 1935, and June 24, 1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the railroad retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the latter act, \$562,534,409: *Provided*, That such total amount shall be available until expended for making payments required under said retirement acts, and the amount not required for current payments shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937."

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order against this substitute amendment that this places additional duties upon the Secretary of the Treasury, and I respectfully call the attention of the chairman to the language of the proposed amendment that the current payment shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] desire to be heard?

Mr. CROSSER. I simply deny the fact. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Ohio cite the law giving the Secretary of the Treasury authority referred to?

The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] seems to place additional duties upon the Secretary of the Treasury not contemplated by law and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to try to understand, if I can, the language offered by the gentleman from New York on behalf of the committee, and just what it would do. I want to know if this is not in fact the same as the other amendment just deleted by point of order.

As I understand, the committee in presenting the language included in the bill attempted to change the method provided in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, whereby funds would be covered into the Treasury on a monthly basis instead of annual basis. Is that true?

Mr. McGRATH. With the accent on "the annual basis."

Mr. HARRIS. Now, I understand the language was subject to a point of order and stricken out. Then the gentleman offers this amendment as a substitute. I have not had an opportunity to read it.

I would like to ask if the gentleman's amendment he has offered as a substitute does not do the same thing that the committee language would have done. I would like to understand it. I may be in accord with what the gentleman offers, but I am not sure that I understand what he wants to do.

Mr. McGRATH. We do not go beyond the fiscal year of 1952.

Mr. HARRIS. Do I understand, then, that the gentleman or his committee has had information from the Treasury Department that after this fiscal year, under the administration of this program they intend to carry out the policy as the committee has outlined in its report?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes; I would say that the answer to the gentleman's question is in the affirmative. The committee has been advised by the Budget Bureau that an arrangement has been worked out with the Treasury to put into effect a new system of tax collection. Beginning with the fiscal year 1952 they will collect taxes monthly instead of quarterly and pay those funds over to the trust fund on a monthly basis. In that way the fund will have the money available quickly for investment and interest-earning purposes.

Mr. HARRIS. I personally would not have any objection to a program under a plan deemed most advisable. I am sure the gentleman understands that in the course of the passage by this Congress of the Railroad Retirement Act that that was discussed. The first act went to the Supreme Court of the United States. Out of that experience the act of 1937 was passed.

I want to understand clearly that any action taken by this committee here today would not in any way affect the decision of the Supreme Court and the plan which provided and which is authorized by that act. Can the gentleman give us that assurance?

Mr. McGRATH. I can say to you absolutely I give you that assurance.

Mr. HARRIS. And if it appears after further consideration that the language in this substitute might in some way seriously affect this program would the gentleman assure us that in the course of the progress of this legislation, or in conference the committee will accept and assist on such clarification as is found advisable and necessary?

Mr. McGRATH. I can assure the gentleman, for whom I have the highest regard, for I consider him one of the most capable Members of the House, that we will consult him in an effort to work it out.

Mr. HARRIS. I appreciate the attitude of the gentleman from New York. He understands as I do that this is a highly important matter and very, very technical. You cannot change the lan-

guage of this law without affecting the purposes and intentions of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield; and I would like to say in yielding to the gentleman from New Jersey that he was here and on the committee at the time this legislation was passed and is one Member of this House who knows as much about it as anyone else.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I hardly wish to qualify to that extent. But it is my opinion that this particular substitute that was offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] is in entire accord with the Retirement Act, and that the wording of the closing sentence of his amendment, reading as follows: "shall be invested by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937," does not change or add to the duties of the Secretary under the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Act and is consequently in order.

Mr. HARRIS. I would like to say to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey that the Chair has already sustained the point of order on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. CROSSER].

What I was trying to do was to clarify the intentions and understand the language presented by the committee here in reference to this matter. I certainly do not think it should be cut out entirely, but I think we should clearly understand just what the language the gentleman proposes will do.

Mr. WOLVERTON. I am of the opinion that it will do what was originally intended by the committee when it put the provision in the original bill and against which the point of order was raised and sustained. In order that there may be a complete understanding of this matter, I wish to bring to the attention of the committee that the appropriation language in the bill, H. R. 3709, beginning in line 15 on page 35 of the bill and continuing through line 16 on page 36, makes a substantive change in the provisions in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act which authorizes appropriations to the railroad retirement account. This section reads as follows:

SEC. 15. (a) There is hereby created an account in the Treasury of the United States to be known as the railroad retirement account. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the account for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, an annual premium, an amount sufficient, with a reasonable margin for contingencies, to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits in accordance with the provisions of this act and the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935. Such amount shall be based on such tables of mortality as the Railroad Retirement Board shall from time to time adopt, and on an interest rate of 3 percent per annum compounded annually. The Railroad Retirement Board shall submit annually to the Bureau of the Budget an estimate of the appropriation to be made to the account.

There is nothing in this section which makes appropriations to the railroad retirement account conditioned upon amounts collected in taxes for the maintenance of the railroad retirement system nor which authorizes in effect a series of monthly appropriations determined by the monthly collections. On the contrary, it authorizes only a single annual appropriation in a definite amount to be determined in accordance with the authorization.

By way of comparison, I direct your attention to section 10 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, which reads in pertinent part as follows:

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of the Treasury shall maintain in the unemployment trust fund established pursuant to section 904 of the Social Security Act an account to be known as the railroad unemployment insurance account. This account shall consist of (1) such part of all contributions collected pursuant to section 8 of this act as is in excess of 0.2 percent of the total compensation on which such contributions are based, together with all interest collected pursuant to section 8 (g) of this act.

The appropriation language in that act does provide that, except for the portion to be deposited in an administration fund, all the contributions collected for the maintenance of the unemployment insurance system shall be deposited in the railroad unemployment insurance account.

The difference between the appropriation language in the two acts leaves no room for doubt that Congress very deliberately authorized different methods of appropriation for the two systems. No one could say reasonably that the appropriation language in the two acts is even similar—that the appropriation language in section 10 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act could be substituted for the appropriation language in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act. Yet this, in substance, is what the bill H. R. 3709 proposes to do. Thus, the language in the bill would make the amount appropriated to the railroad retirement account and the time the appropriation becomes effective conditioned upon the amount and timing of collections under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act similar to the provision in the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. The language in the bill, though it gives lip service to the words "annual premium," makes no reference to section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act, which is the statutory authority for the appropriation to the railroad retirement account.

That Congress provided different methods for the making of appropriations under the two acts may be further seen from section 16 of the Railroad Retirement Act, which provides as follows:

SEC. 16. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to provide for the expenses of the Board in administering the provisions of this act and the Railroad Retirement Act of 1935.

And from section 11 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act which provides in pertinent part as follows:

SEC. 11. (a) There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the railroad unemployment insurance administration fund. This fund shall consist of (i) such part of all contributions collected pursuant to section 8 of this act as equals 0.2 percent of the total compensation on which such contributions are based.

The failure of any reference in section 16 of the Railroad Retirement Act to taxes collected for the maintenance of the railroad retirement system, and the specific reference to contributions in section 11 (a) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act is further proof of congressional intent to distinguish between the methods of appropriation for the two acts.

In practice the amounts appropriated to the railroad retirement account are so adjusted from year to year as to result in appropriations of no more than is actually collected in taxes. But the method of appropriation established in section 15 (a) of the Retirement Act was deliberately adopted for an important purpose. When it was enacted it was considered important to the constitutional basis of the legislation that this method be followed. If the validity of that consideration is now to be questioned and a different authorization for appropriations proposed, such a step cannot properly be considered here until the legislative committee responsible for railroad retirement legislation gives the matter its consideration.

The question here is solely whether the Appropriations Committee of the House can take upon itself the authority to override and change the method established by Congress for making appropriations to the railroad retirement account; whether the Appropriations Committee of the House can override the practice followed for the past 9 years by appropriation committees, including this very Appropriations Committee, in making appropriations to the railroads retirement account in accordance with the provisions of section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act.

We cannot properly here debate the wisdom or the propriety of the present provision in the Railroad Retirement Act with regard to appropriations to the railroad retirement account. I am only arguing for a proper and orderly procedure in this respect. If the Appropriations Committee is convinced that the provisions in section 15 (a) of the Railroad Retirement Act should be changed, the proper form for a discussion of this question is the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which was responsible for the enactment of the original provision in 1937 and before which all persons having an interest in the issue can be afforded an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. HARRIS. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that I have some very serious suspicions on it myself. We should not legislate on these appropriation bills. This is too technical and if any changes are made in the basic

law it should be after full hearings by our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on which I have the honor to serve and which has legislative jurisdiction of this subject. It affects several hundred thousand railroad employees. It means too much to them and the industry to adopt basic changes in the law without knowing the effects.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 119, noes 5.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$3,047,000.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas. On page 37, line 14, strike out "\$3,047,000" and insert "\$2,949,700."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am submitting applies to one agency only. If approved, it will reduce the appropriation by \$97,300. It will mean the agency will still have the same amount it had last year. This agency did ask for still more money, but the committee granted the increase indicated in the bill. Now, take a brief look. This agency, comparatively small in size, asked for \$3,247,000 for salaries and expenses for 404 people, some of them only part-time employees. That is an over-all average for all employees of \$8,000 per year. This is counting stenographer, clerks, and others at comparatively lower salaries. This would indicate some of them are doing pretty well in the way of salaries. I remind you the request indicates is for part-time assistance. This part-time assistance is to be paid on the basis of \$75 per day and expenses. The agency is allowed to go out and employ whom it chooses and pay as much as \$75 per day without consideration of civil-service requirements.

Neither the bill nor the report nor the hearings indicate how much of this fund of more than \$3,000,000 is to be spent on the \$75-a-day employees. Nothing is said about the required qualifications of these employees. The bill says, in substance, you propose to spend more than \$3,000,000 for salaries and expenses of officers, employees, temporary employees that include "arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations." The hearings indicate the employment of approximately 400 people. There is an additional item of \$50,000 for office expense in the District of Columbia. Incidentally, it may be said this expenditure is in support of labor.

Whether that be correct or not, I cannot imagine the rank and file of labor wanting to increase an item that will pay any agency employees an average of more than \$8,000 per year, many of them working only part time. Nor for paying a lot of additional persons I have described more than \$50 per day and expenses for part-time service.

My amendment is a mild one. It just says the agency cannot expend more than last year. But, if you approve it, there will be a savings of \$97,300 to the taxpayers of this country. Even then you are still being pretty liberal with this agency.

This amendment should be approved.

Following action on the pending amendment, if I may have the attention of the Chair, I shall offer a further amendment which will reduce the maximum of \$75 a day proposed in this bill back to \$50 a day.

Mr. Chairman, something has been said about the fine manner in which the affairs of this agency have been administered by its present Administrator, Mr. Ching. From what I have heard concerning Mr. Ching, he is one of the most industrious and able men at the head of any of our agencies. He is highly respected by those who know him personally. I do think, however, that if permitted to select men for these higher paid positions—without pressure or influence of any kind—he can do a still better job. If he were allowed to select all of these appointees without political influence of any kind, it would be helpful to his agency as well as to those whom the agency serves.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly do not want to cripple the functions of any needed service. But here is a place where an agency, in view of the condition of the Federal Treasury, and the mounting cost of government ought to be willing to cut any unnecessary expenses, work just a little harder and save a little money for needed expenditures for the defense of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I want to repeat a statement I have made on the floor of this House I have made many times before. The expenditures for each and every civilian agency should be made on the basis of absolute need, and in the light of the tremendous tax load charged against the people of this country.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, since the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service has been headed by Cyrus Ching, who I believe has the respect of most Members of Congress and of the people of the country, the committee has found that he has been one of the most conservative administrators of any agency that has appeared before it. He has asked for an increase this year of \$297,000. The committee cut that in-

crease asked for by \$200,000, thinking that much was all that could be imposed. We placed in the record how many employees he had in 1946, 1950, 1951, and 1952. In 1946 they had 488 employees; in 1950, 351; in 1951, 364. He asked for 406 employees, but with the money we allowed in the committee bill they will probably not have over 375 employees, which is 113 less than they had in 1946. We think he has been doing a good job with the personnel he has had, but I think we must remember this one pertinent thing, and I think it should be remembered by everyone, that in times of an emergency there is always a great demand by the public to avoid strikes and maintain production. A principal purpose of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service is to prevent strikes, and they have prevented many times more strikes than have occurred in the past 2 or 3 years because of the leadership of Cyrus Ching and the type of personnel he has working under him. We think he is one of the ablest administrators we have in any Federal agency. Because of the experience in the last war when more men were needed in order to prevent strikes before they occur, we allowed him a small increase this year of \$97,000 with the hope that he could prevent strikes that might otherwise take place in the next fiscal year. Now, that is the kind of a record he has and that is the record that he is living under and that is the record that he is known by. I do not believe there is a Member of the Congress that will dispute the statement that I have just made. We all have a great deal of confidence in him. We feel he has a good organization. We believe that he needs this mere handful of additional personnel allowed under the \$97,000, and we think it will pay off in the end by giving him the implements to do the work with. He has the know-how, he has the organization, and we are convinced he can do a good job if we give him the implements to work with. That was our main reason for giving him the small increase, because of the emergency we are in at the present time.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We all agree that Chairman Ching is a great man. Does not the gentleman think that with the over-all picture, when you are allowing over \$8,000 a year for the whole 400 and some odd people, that that is pretty fair, liberal, and average payment for employees in an agency? I realize that it is just as important and more important than a good many others, but even so, does not the gentleman feel that he is pretty liberal even cutting the figure back this small amount of \$90,000?

Mr. FOGARTY. We cut them \$200,000 and we went into this thing very thoroughly. There was no disposition on the part of the committee to increase anywhere as we have shown. We have cut practically everywhere, and if it was within the power of the committee, if we thought in good conscience that this could have been cut more and it would

not hurt his organization as it is functioning at the present time, we certainly would have cut it more. It was based on bare facts that he gave and the experience that we had during the last emergency that we allowed this small increase.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Just that much more than you allowed last year.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, because of the emergency we are in. The Korean situation was not with us when we had this bill up a year ago. Because of the vast defense production program, we think it is more essential now to give them that additional personnel than it was a year ago. That is the only reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REES of Kansas: Page 37, line 11, strike out "\$75" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50."

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I mentioned a few minutes ago.

This amendment reduces the maximum of payment under this bill from \$75 per day to \$50 per day. If you will refer to page 37 of the bill, the first paragraph refers to salaries and expenses, and then it states that the appropriation for \$3,047,000 includes "temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators," and so forth, at rates "not in excess of \$75 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings" and so forth. In other words, \$75 per day and expenses. All authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946.

Now, I call your attention to section 13, Public Law 600, of the Seventy-ninth Congress, which states:

The head of any department, when authorized in an appropriation or other act, may procure temporary (not in excess of 1 year) or intermittent services of experts or consultants or organizations thereof, including stenographic reporting services, by contract, and in such cases such service shall be without regard to the civil-service and classification laws—

Then in parentheses it says—

but as to agencies subject to the Classification Act at rates not in excess of the per diem equivalent of the highest rate payable under the Classification Act—

Note this—

unless other rates are specifically provided in the appropriation.

So in line with that clause allowed in an appropriation bill and hike that rate up to \$75.

The Comptroller General has submitted an opinion that says in substance that if you follow this section of the law, leaving out what I call the "escape" clause, the amount you would be permitted to pay on the per diem basis would be \$42.42 per day, a little less than \$50 per day.

It will be argued that the Administrator may not be able to secure competent people for this so-called part-time work at \$50 per day and expenses. My first

answer is that according I have received, he has not been required to do that thus far. I call your attention to the fact there is no limit to the length of time during which these special people may be employed. More than that, nothing is said concerning qualification requirements. Nothing is said in the bill or the report as to the number that may be employed. Suppose administration officials insist on certain persons being appointed, what is the Administrator going to do about it. There should be a limitation on the number to be appointed under this provision of the bill. I am informed an amendment to do that now will be ruled out as not being germane. The committee should have written some such provision in the bill.

I respect the statement of the chairman of this committee that the chairman of this agency is one of the best known, and among those who are most respected in our agencies, but it seems to me you are going a little far when you bring in an appropriation bill and say that we are going to pay a group of people, I do not know how many, \$75 per day, then go still further and put no limitation in this bill. It does not say how many you are going to hire at \$75 a day or \$60 a day or \$50 a day; not at all. You open the gate. Later we will have legislation asking that the amount be fixed at \$100 per day. Again I call attention there are no qualification requirements in the bill. Not at all. As I said a little while ago, there is not even anything in the testimony submitted in the hearings to say what the qualifications may be.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that when the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service approved legislation permitting the President to break the ceiling on Federal salaries, the number of persons in each category and salary allowed was fixed in the legislation. Has any member of the committee computed the amount an employee would draw at \$75 per day if he worked for a year? He could work 5 days a week, take 2 days off, and make \$18,750 and his expenses.

Mr. Chairman, this committee, and the membership of this House, would, if they knew the amounts expended, be interested in the cost of the services of engineers hired on a contract basis in advisory capacity to some of our agencies. I am not right here criticizing the service, but the amount expended runs in rather high figures.

Again I want to pay my high regard and respect to the chairman of the subcommittee the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]. He has made a good presentation of this legislation to the committee. He has been eminently fair, even though we may disagree. I hope the committee will support my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I anticipated when this appropriation bill came up in which the agencies of labor are quite considerably involved, that again the labor movement would be the whipping-boy. The last vote was an indication to me which I simply could not let pass without presenting to the House some of the involvement. So far as Mr. Ching is concerned, I am not always in agreement with him, because to me he is quite conservative. As a matter of fact he is a little too conservative so far as people are concerned for whom he has tried to mediate fair and equitable agreements. But this is what has happened in this field. During the Eightieth Congress in my city where the Conciliation and Mediation agency is located, you have three field men. As a result of the cut in the budget of the Mediation and Conciliation Service, it meant the laying off of two of the field men. With about 1,500 separate labor unions in the State of Minnesota whose contracts come up every year there has been in the House of Representatives and in every other legislative body an appeal that those labor unions have a little patience in their attempt and in their desire to arrive at a settlement without a wage dispute or a labor dispute.

For the past three years I have been beset by the labor unions in the State of Minnesota for some relief in their efforts to get a field man from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service to sit in and try to iron out the differences between management and labor. In the office of Mr. Carlgren in Minneapolis I venture to say that as of this date there are over 400 requests for mediation between employers and the labor unions awaiting action. I think we in Washington sympathized very much with the railway trainmen who recently had a dispute here which all of us felt was a rather desperate situation, but after waiting two years patience ceases to be a virtue, and unless there is machinery to process these fights, justice will not be done. I hope this cut will not pass and that the representative of the Federal Mediation Board be preserved so that we can process some of these labor disputes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know how this Congress can justify increasing this rate to \$75 a day. If we are for anything we are in favor of stabilizing these prices and preventing further advances in the price level. That means no further advances in wages and salaries. I say, if we are for anything we are in favor of stabilizing these prices.

Take the work days in a year and multiply them by 50, and you will find that it is a little more salary than you get as a Member of Congress. If you put it up to \$75 a day, from a straight dollar standpoint it seems to me a great many Members of Congress would be seeking

to be released from their present jobs and going out and taking some of this per diem gravy. I wish someone would get up here and justify this increase in pay that is proposed here.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, I yield.

Mr. WIER. I will tell you what is happening all over the country. Major industry all over this country has put on their own personnel labor directors. Where do they get them?

Mr. CRAWFORD. What does that have to do with stabilizing the price level?

Mr. WIER. It has this to do with it—

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now I do not yield any further. That is all I have time for. I asked a question and you started talking about major industry. You can condemn one side or the other until you have the wage level up to \$50 an hour, and the price of a loaf of bread up to \$6 a loaf. You cannot justify your argument in favor of stabilizing wages and then sit here every chance you get and vote to increase wages. Let us support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] and hold this rate to \$50 per day at the present time, and I will wager the Administrator, Mr. Ching, can get all the good people he needs. There is no question about that in my mind.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] knows whether Mr. Ching can get these men or not. For 3 or 4 years he has been telling the committee he cannot get them, and if there is anybody who knows whether he can get them or not, that one man is Mr. Ching.

I think we should realize this: Emergency boards appointed by the President in railroad disputes are paid \$100 a day per member. There are arbitrators in this country who are getting more than \$100 a day. In the item we just passed, the National Railroad Adjustment Board, they give \$75 a day to referees in deadlocked cases.

It has been testified by Mr. Ching that they are taken away from a business of some kind, or they have judges in some cases who are experts in some particular field. You cannot send a carpenter in to settle a nation-wide steel strike. They must have someone who is of a high type and high caliber. If you do not have that type of man you cannot expect the results you are after. You cannot send an unqualified man in to do a real man's job in settling a nation-wide dispute.

The fact is this was raised from \$50 to \$75 a year or so ago. It is not, as someone mentioned, that we are raising it this year for the first time. Mr. Ching testified before this committee previously that it was impossible for him to get men. The rate at that time was \$35 a day. He could not get men to sit on these boards who were qualified, in his judgment, to do the job of mediating

and conciliating these particular disputes on a nation-wide basis.

During the hearings I said, "This year these people get \$75." Mr. Ching said, "Yes."

We had some language in the bill for 1951 to pay the men \$75 a day, but up until the time this hearing was held not one dime was spent for this particular kind of arbitration. It is put in there for a purpose. When he gets into a stalemate on a Nation-wide basis, when he has to take men away from business or a man sitting on the supreme court in some State, who has had experience in settling these particular disputes, that is the man he reaches for and gets, because he is the most competent man, in his opinion, to handle and settle that dispute. That is the only reason we have it in there, not because of anything the committee wants to do, but because of the evidence that was presented to us which indicated that it was the thing to do. It is merely standby authority to be used only when it is really needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Page 39, after line 7, add a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or

propaganda purposes not heretofore authorized by the Congress."

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to prevent as far as possible the spending of unreasonable amounts for propaganda and publicity purposes. It in no way affects the amount as authorized in this bill. The two agencies affected are Labor and Federal Security.

We know that as far as Mr. Ewing is concerned he is constantly propagandizing the country on socialized medicine.

A look at an analysis or a breakdown of the schedule shows that for Labor, item No. 6, Printing and reproduction, we have the amount of \$532,151. Just what that covers I have not been able to discover, at least members of the committee on our side of the aisle have not been able to learn specifically what is covered.

Under social security we give to Mr. Ewing the grand sum of \$2,185,615 for printing and reproduction. We have some idea, I believe, we know what some of this money will go for. I want to call attention to the testimony that was developed in the committee on the activities of Mr. Ewing, and at this point I would like to say to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], that I believe he and his subcommittee have been tough on the social-security agency, they have done a fine job but I think we can be still more tough on Mr. Ewing. I would like to read a colloquy between the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HEDRICK], of the committee, and Mr. Ewing from page 346 of the hearings for the Federal Security Agency:

Mr. HEDRICK. Mr. Ewing, you stated a few minutes ago that you made a good many speeches and had requests to make lots of speeches.

Mr. EWING. Yes.

Mr. HEDRICK. I would like to inquire how many speeches you made during the calendar year of 1950 advocating compulsory health insurance.

Mr. EWING. I would have to check that.

Mr. HEDRICK. About how many?

Mr. EWING. I would be afraid to guess. I think I furnished the figures for 1949 to the Buchanan committee, but I have never made it up for this.

Mr. HEDRICK. What about 1949?

Mr. EWING. I believe it is here. However, I do not think they break it down as to subject matter. I have that broken down someplace.

This information was apparently submitted later:

A total of 18 speeches dealing in whole or in part with health insurance were delivered during the calendar year 1949 by the Federal Security Administrator, or one of his immediate assistants keeping a speaking engagement which he was unable to fill.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I think I can add to the gentleman's statement by saying that in the educational field much propaganda has come out of that office advocating the transition from a national sovereignty to a one-world government. I know that because the superintendent of public instruction in my State received part of this material.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman for his observation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Would not the effect of the gentleman's amendment in using the word "propaganda" jeopardize publication by the Children's Bureau of pamphlets pertaining to the training and growth of children? The Children's Bureau put out a number of pamphlets on the subject of children, including the subject of infant care and progressively the subjects are dealt with as the ages of the children advance. Would not the gentleman believe that using the term "propaganda" without attempting to limit it to the health-insurance program would jeopardize the entire program of the National Security Agency and should not the gentleman's amendment more properly be addressed to propaganda concerning the health-insurance program?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I would not agree with the gentleman. It seems to me that we can well distinguish between what is propaganda and what is educational matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think there is a very marked distinction. The gentleman's amendment runs only to matters which have not had the support or the approval of the Congress. The matter of getting out booklets has always had the approval of Congress through action of the committee on which the gentleman serves.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. In the gentleman's opening statement he made reference to two agencies that were getting out considerable printed matter and propaganda. Let us get back to the Labor Department. Has the gentleman at any time witnessed any material coming out of the Labor Department which he would term propaganda?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Well, I think that is obvious.

Mr. WIER. Let us talk about propaganda now.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. That is propaganda.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BUSBEY. While we are talking about Oscar Ewing, I asked for a breakdown from Mr. Ewing when we had the hearings on the travel expenses of not

only himself but the other members of his administrative staff, which I shall include in the Record.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by merely pointing out that this is a prohibition which affects those agencies that have not already been set up and their present programs. It does, however, prohibit the extension of propaganda and publicity any further. I intend in future appropriation bills to attempt to have inserted this same provision because I believe that the American people are fed up with political and propaganda handouts from the Federal Government. This is an abuse that strikes directly at our free institutions. The time to stop the practice is now.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I know the membership of the committee will be interested to know some of the traveling expenses that have been incurred in the Federal Security Agency.

May I give this information to the committee at this time:

Mr. Ewing has spent a total of \$3,-398.22; Mr. Thurston, \$807.31; Mr. Bernstein, \$2,607.96; Anna Hedgeman, \$2,384.15; Mary Switzer, \$1,148; Theodore Hayes, \$236.10; Jewell Swofford, \$1,211.96; and Elizabeth Kavary, \$1,-963.94; making a total of \$13,758.48.

There are other totals to be added, such as administrative planning, budget division, personnel division, and service operations amounting to \$4,465.98, and some information that went along with those speeches amounting to \$863.84, making a grand total of \$19,088.30.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, but I hope that all future appropriation bills will contain this provision. It seems to me that if we are to save the taxpayers money the one place we can do it is to place a limitation on the propaganda machine of the Federal Government. I do not have the recent figures of the publicity and propaganda activities of the Government. The latest that are available are 1946. But, the Budget Bureau shows that in 1946 the total expenditures in the Executive branch for publicity and propaganda amounted to \$75,000,000. That probably was raised, from the information I have been able to get from the various departments, amounting to an increase in appropriations of something over \$100,000,000 as of today.

Back in 1946 there were 45,000 Federal employees engaged in information and publicity and propaganda activities of the Federal Government where you could put your finger on them, but the greater bulk of the publicity and propaganda that goes on within the executive departments of our Government is not conducted by those who are listed as information specialists but those who are drawing salaries under some other heading and going out to organize their

influence on the Congress throughout the country. In 1946 it was \$75,000,000; today it is probably \$100,000,000, but just 10 years ago the figure for publicity and propaganda in the United States was \$27,770,000; or, in other words, there has been an increase over the past 10 years of over three hundred-fold in the amount of the taxpayers money that is being used for that purpose.

Let me just call your attention to a few of the things that are done with taxpayers money to bring that about. In the Federal Security Agency, in their attempt to propagandize for socialized medicine, they set up teams to send throughout the country to organize local groups and then get those local groups to put the heat on the Congress. One of the bulletins and one of the pamphlets taken from the files of the Federal Security Agency to be used by their training officers set out to organize these meetings show the following: These are the topics that the training officers have to use in organizing these groups. First, they are to set up techniques for the organization of citizens groups; the second thing is the formation of pressure groups and, third, methods of bringing about group action. The Federal employees were being paid to go out to organize groups to bring pressure on this Congress. One of these statements said that the Federal employees arranged the meetings; they invited the delegates; they trained the delegates, they presided at the meetings, and then framed a formal summary of resolution for action.

Mr. Chairman, I say that the one place we certainly can save the taxpayers money is the adoption of this amendment and amendments similar to it in all future appropriation bills to cut out this illegal expenditure which amounts to something over \$100,000,000 a year.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER].

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Chairman, I think this subject is one of greatest importance to the Congress. It deserves more attention than can be given in this fashion in debate on an amendment to an appropriation bill. We are indebted to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] for the information he has presented here in this debate this afternoon, which he derived from his service as counsel for a committee investigating propaganda activities of the Federal Government.

There is far more than merely the amount of money involved in this particular principle. I have previously urged my belief that it is necessary to strengthen the Congress in the interest of formulating national policy by the

people themselves. It is a corollary to that principle that public opinion ought not to be subjected to influence and direction by the executive agencies, the administrative branch of the Government, in the manner that it is today. In a democracy, where public opinion rules in the long run, the media of communication: the press, the radio, television, and the printed word, are very potent weapons in the control of the affairs of this country. The people should not finance use of these agencies to foster and perpetuate the bureaucrats—not the people's objectives in national policy.

If \$100,000,000 is being spent by the Federal agencies in the executive branch of the Government for the purpose of influencing opinion, I say that is a trend and a tendency which is not in the interest of government by the people but in the direction of bureaucratic direction of the thinking of the electorate of this country. That is the basic question which is involved in the principle involved here in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I am not sure that simply prohibiting the use of funds for publicity and propaganda will be an adequate way to deal with this problem. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee to what extent the subcommittee has been able to isolate activities of the Federal Government devoted to propaganda and publicity, and how many employees and how much expense is involved in those activities.

Mr. FOGARTY. For the benefit of the gentleman, I will say that 2 or 3 years ago Mr. Ewing was isolated from most of the publicity and propaganda that was being issued out of that office. When he gets a look at the job they have done on his office today, when they cut out an additional \$250,000, there is not going to be much left in there for any publicity worth while or for the next fiscal year. Whenever we hear of these things, they are taken care of.

Mr. MEADER. Does the committee have a staff which, the year around, examines into the propaganda and publicity activities of the agencies under the jurisdiction of the gentleman's committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. At the request of the subcommittee, a staff can be arranged to investigate anything. We do not even know what the gentleman calls propaganda. We do not know what he calls the right type of publicity or the wrong type of publicity. That is the fault I find with this amendment.

Mr. MEADER. May I say to the gentleman that I should like to support any movement or any request he may make for additional staff so that we may find out the details about these expenditures and to what extent the agencies which are supposed to carry out policy are attempting to influence policy. In my judgment, the policy should be made here in the Congress and it should be carried out in the executive branch of the Government. It is wrong to have the executive branch of the Government spending the taxpayers' funds to influence public thinking and to create policy.

Mr. FOGARTY. I agree with the gentleman. I also think it should be brought to our attention that the gentleman has just referred to a gentleman who served as counsel for a committee back in 1947 and 1948. The chairman of that committee came before our committee, which was then controlled by the Republicans, and Frank Keefe was chairman of the committee, making some of the charges that have been made this afternoon. They were proven false. There was not an iota of truth about that charge at all. That was under the leadership of the gentleman's own party.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEADER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. Can the gentleman tell me of any one statement that was made on this floor by me this afternoon which was proven to be false in the Keefe committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not say that.

Mr. BOW. That is exactly the language that was used.

Mr. FOGARTY. Let me get the gentleman straight on that. I am talking about the chairman of the committee the gentleman worked for. He appeared before our committee. There was not one iota of truth in the charges he made before that committee. That is what I said. I speak plain English, and I think the gentleman can hear me as well as anybody else can.

Mr. BOW. Will the gentleman say what was in the committee report I have read from today that was proven in the Keefe committee not to be true?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not refer to the gentleman, I referred to the chairman that he worked for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] to close debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to get excited about this amendment, or at least I will try not to get excited, but I do think it is a poor way of doing business. Here you are limiting the amount of publicity and propaganda which may be issued by any agency of government in this bill and yet you do not define in the amendment what propaganda is or what publicity is. You have no idea at all of the number of publications that are issued or of the type of publications, or anything else. All you want to do is to cut it out and not a word is said about where the cut is to be made. The same thing has been done this afternoon on some of these other cuts. You do not seem to care where the cuts are or whom they are going to affect or how much harm they are going to do to that particular agency or to the defense of the country. I say that especially with reference to the cut which was made on the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service just a few moments ago.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. MEADER. Does the gentleman have any idea how much additional staff he would need for his subcommittee to

distinguish between legitimate publications such as statistical reports and other official reports of that kind by executive agencies, and propaganda which is designed to influence public opinion? Can the gentleman tell me how much of a staff he would need and whether he has asked for it?

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the proper way to get at the bottom of this entire thing is that the gentleman from Wisconsin who has offered the amendment and all the others who have spoken in favor of it should come up with some concrete evidence of what is being issued as propaganda now from the Department of Labor and from the Federal Security Agency. When you give us the proper evidence, then we will take steps. When you produce the proper evidence we will get a sufficient staff to make a thorough investigation. I make that as a promise now. You produce the evidence and give us some of these booklets and pamphlets that you claim are propaganda and are being issued by particular agencies and we will take proper action.

The matter will not have to come before the Congress. The committee will do it, I will go along with the rest of the committee and see to it. I will cut out every dime in the appropriation if you give us any evidence of any pamphlet or booklet or propaganda, which is in a real sense propaganda. I will go along with the rest of the subcommittee and cut out every dime of it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. The testimony of Oscar Ewing answers the gentleman's question. He has been propagandizing for compulsory health insurance. He admits it in his own testimony. Is that not propaganda?

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from Wisconsin is talking about his travel.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. No, I am not.

Mr. FOGARTY. It would have been an education for you, may I say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, to have been able to sit in with the subcommittee. I do not believe that any man has appeared before us who has been questioned more closely as to his activities and matters he advocates than has the Federal Security Administrator. It is not anything new. It has been going on since he has been Administrator.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Of course, we know that and that is what we are trying to get at in this amendment. He made 18 speeches in 1950, according to his own testimony.

Mr. FOGARTY. That was in 1950. He is not going to do it in 1951, and I do not believe he is going to do it in 1952 because he knows how the committee feels about it.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I am from Missouri.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I have asked the gentleman from Rhode Island to yield in an effort to be helpful to him.

Let me suggest that if he wants evidence as to the unnecessary publicity and propaganda being put out by this and other Government agencies, all he has to do when we close debate today and the Committee rises, and after the House adjourns, is to go over to his office and look in his own wastebasket.

Mr. FOGARTY. A lot of it is coming from the National Association of Manufacturers and the chambers of commerce and all the rest of them. That is where I am getting all the publicity and propaganda.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am sure the gentleman throws away everything that he receives from the National Association of Manufacturers.

I am sure he throws everything that he receives from the National Association of Manufacturers into the wastebasket and nothing from the CIO.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not. I read them all, because I like to get both sides of the subject. I want to find out who is right and who is wrong, and then try to make up my own honest opinion, and I wish everybody else would do the same.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. A great deal of it comes from the organization of Mr. Rumely, who was convicted today of contempt of court. The resolution to cite him for contempt only passed the House of Representatives by five or six votes.

Most of the Republicans voted against authorizing the contempt proceedings.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 144, noes 92.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. FOGARTY and Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 156, noes 88.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JENSEN: Page 39, line 8, insert a new section, as follows:

"No part of any appropriations or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and Freedmen's Hospital;

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2."

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, the effect of my amendment is to permit the Labor-Federal Security agencies to fill 25 percent of the vacancies which occur in those agencies during the fiscal year 1952, with some exceptions, as you will note.

The report on this bill indicates budget reductions of some \$89,973,799 on this bill. However it is not possible to definitely determine just how many people will have to be dropped as a result of this action. Some of the cuts are very substantial and the committee is to be congratulated on their action; however the bulk of the reductions are in items for other administrative cuts. For example, the bill effected reductions in the following, which will have little, if any, effect on administrative costs:

Contingency reserve for Bureau of	
Employment Security reduced..	\$4,000,000
Employees compensation fund..	1,000,000
Vocational education grants.....	1,794,499
Payments to States for vocational rehabilitation.....	2,525,000
Grants to States for hospital construction	20,000,000
Grants to States for public assistance	50,000,000
Grants to States for child welfare	3,000,000
Total.....	82,319,499

It will be noted, therefore, that this leaves something over \$7,000,000 to be applied to administrative costs. How much of this will be applied to the reduction of personnel is questionable since a portion of it could be applied to the procurement of equipment, supplies, and contractual services of various kinds. Thus it can be readily seen that the reduction in personnel is relatively small, probably less than 1,000 employees from the budget request.

I have prepared a tabulation from the appendix of the budget document showing the average number of employees for fiscal years 1950-51 and estimated for 1952. This indicates a total number of employees in this bill of 43,900 in 1950, 46,800 in 1951, and 48,600 for 1952. It is true that some of the specific agencies show less employees; nevertheless in the aggregate there appears to be almost 5,000 more employees requested in 1952 than was provided in 1950. The largest increase seems to be in the Trust Fund of the Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance which accounts for about 3,800 of the increase.

It might be argued that with respect to this particular bureau that they are not paid for out of appropriated funds, nevertheless this should not be any reason for letting them get out of line. The more we protect the trust fund the less necessary it will be to increase the insurance rate to our citizens in the years to come.

Turn-over in the Government is a serious matter and this amendment, while seeking economy as its primary objective, also provides an incentive for the agencies of government to try to hold the resignations down which in itself provides some economy in the retention of trained employees and the savings of payments for accrued annual leave. Under this amendment if the agencies can improve working conditions

and keep employees longer, they are not penalized.

In the hearings before the Independent Offices Appropriations Subcommittee the Civil Service Commission testified that they expect a 3 percent per month turn-over rate government-wide—page 406, part 1—in fiscal year 1952. It is currently running at a rate of about 2.5 percent and the increase is expected to follow the pattern of the last war when it reached a peak of 5.5 percent in 1943.

This amendment is tailored to fit these particular agencies and will not work any hardship. It is noted also that transfers within the agencies are permitted under my amendment.

On the medical side we are also exempting medical personnel. It is our intention to exempt those medical services directly contributing to the comfort and welfare of the patient. This does not exempt administrative, statistical, and general maintenance personnel. We have likewise exempted custodial employees in the lower grades recognizing that the turn-over rate is quite high in this category.

It is estimated that this amendment will deny the employment of about 8,000 persons in the fiscal year 1952 from the approximately 48,000 requested. Since they will be going off the rolls on a gradual basis we will assume that the 8,000 is the equivalent of 4,000 on a full-year basis. This would figure roughly about \$16,000,000 from the budget request less whatever the committee cut amounts to in terms of personnel. I estimate that this amendment will further reduce the bill now before the House by ten to eleven million dollars.

Mr. Chairman, this is the painless way, and the effective way, to reduce needless Federal employees.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time for the sole purpose of asking the author of the amendment a question. I should like to ask the gentleman whether his amendment applies to veterans within the departments.

Mr. JENSEN. No. No one who is employed today is affected by this amendment whatsoever.

Mr. YATES. What about applicants for jobs who are veterans?

Mr. JENSEN. Well, of course, it applies to them. However, they have priority under the law.

Mr. YATES. But they could not get a job in the face of your amendment even though they have priority under the law.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that the veterans of America are more concerned about saving America than anyone else that I know of. Certainly the gentleman knows that we have today over 2,200,000 people on the Federal payroll which is at least 750,000 more than we should have. The civilian payroll today is costing around \$9,000,000,000. If the gentleman wants to support that kind of needless employment, why he can just go ahead.

Mr. YATES. I take it that the answer to my question about disbaring applicants who are veterans is "Yes."

Mr. JENSEN. Of course it will.

Mr. YATES. That is all.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make this amendment clear to the House. It prohibits the filling of vacancies except to the extent of 25 percent of all those that occur. It makes an exception of hospitals, both in the regular Public Health Service and the one out at Bethesda, and several other units where it is absolutely necessary to fill vacancies.

Veterans who are employed would not be affected. Veterans would be able to have priority on appointments to the 25 percent of vacancies that would be filled.

We all know that the only way really to reduce Federal personnel is to stop the filling of vacancies, and that is what this amendment will do.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I should like to observe in respect to the question asked of the gentleman from Iowa by the gentleman from Illinois just a moment ago that it apparently would contemplate that we were to keep any number of jobs available just so that a veteran might have an opportunity to apply for one of them. My guess about that would be that the veteran would resent that sort of an argument just as much as anyone else here.

Mr. TABER. He would. On top of that, there is a turn-over in the different departments of close to 20 percent in a year. There is going to be plenty of opportunity for the veterans with their preferences to get jobs as things go along.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Is it not a fact that we passed approximately this same amendment in the House last year in the omnibus appropriation bill?

Mr. TABER. No, that applied to 10 percent of vacancies and this one applies to 25 percent of vacancies.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This is far more liberal than the one the House accepted last year?

Mr. TABER. Yes; and it has other provisions in it. It is a very much broader amendment and more liberal to the departments. I think it is absolutely necessary if we are ever going to save any money to adopt an amendment of this character.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. May I say in answer to the question of the gentleman who asked me about the veterans that if anybody is going to oppose this amendment on the ground that veterans do not have preference, he certainly does not have to worry about the veterans of America being afraid not to get along in America so long as we have an America.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. What if it becomes necessary as a result of events to take a number of people out of Government jobs and put them in the armed forces? Would not this amendment play havoc with respect to the replacement of people in Government positions?

Mr. TABER. No, it would not.

Mr. JENSEN. It would be just exactly the opposite.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 6 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is similar to one that was offered to the over-all, one-package appropriation bill last year by the gentleman from Iowa. This one is a little more liberal, but it is the same type of amendment offered at that time. It was carried in the House but it has never been carried into law. It was thrown out in the House and Senate conference because they deemed it at that time to be unworkable, impossible of operation, and everything else. I never heard the conferees condemn an amendment so much as they did that one, because they found there was no possible way of making it work.

The amendment the gentleman offers today is not quite as bad as that one. He exempted the same personnel. Instead of limiting it to 10 percent of vacancies that might be filled in the next year, he raises it to 25 percent. But that is the liberal part of the bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. If my amendment had been made law last year we would have saved half a billion dollars, possibly, but instead of that Congress abdicated and we said to the Bureau of the Budget, "Now, you save \$550,000,000."

Mr. FOGARTY. But it was impossible, may I say to my friend, it was impossible to operate. They just could not find any head nor tail on the whole thing. You could not find out where it began and where it ended. You could not tell at the time it was offered how many jobs were involved or how many jobs it would exempt or what classifications were going to be exempt. I remember very well the afternoon it was offered nobody in the House knew about it. You took us by surprise. There was not a man in the House who could tell us exactly how far the amendment went.

Mr. JENSEN. And it passed the House and should have been made the law of the land, and should be the law today.

Mr. FOGARTY. Not with my vote.

I do not know where the figures came from which the gentleman from Iowa

gave as to the number of positions that are increased in this over-all appropriation bill, but as I recall hearing the figures he gave you, they were way out of line. The figures I have are as given to me by the Clerk who we believe to be infallible, and who is one of the best clerks in the House, and one of the most able and conscientious men. He has handed me these figures. The bill as we have reported it to you, in the Labor Department alone, provides for a cut of about 670 positions below what they had in 1951, assuming the cuts against administrative appropriations are all applied to salary items, as most of it would be. That is not below the budget estimate, but below what they had in 1951. The Clerk informed me that figure comes from a quick calculation made by the Department at his request. As far as the Federal Security Agency is concerned, on the same basis, we cut them about 880 positions below what they had last year—not below the budget estimate, but below what they had last year. That is what we are talking about. We are not talking about budget estimates. We are talking about decreases and cuts that we have made below the 1951 figures, and if you show me another committee that comes in with a bill like this one and which will show as deep cuts as we have made I want to be around to see it. In all honesty and in all fairness to the gentleman from Iowa, I want to say that we have been sincere in our efforts this year to bring in a good bill. We have gone much further in cuts than I would like to have gone, to be honest with you. Deeper cuts have been made in places in this bill than I have voted for since I have been a member of this committee.

I believe it was the insistence of men like George Schwabe and Fred Busbey and others, and some on the Democratic side, and because of the situation we find ourselves in at the present time, as well as our economic situation, that I went along because we wanted to have a unanimous report. I tried to explain yesterday in general debate the limited field that we have to work in where we can make cuts. I tried to explain yesterday that 88 percent of the appropriations for the Department of Labor is tied up in items that we cannot touch because it is in two grants, grants to the States for employment security, and the employees compensation fund. Those two items amount to 88 percent of the total Labor Department appropriation bill. We only had 12 percent of the appropriation to work with, and we cut that part of the appropriation by almost 10 percent. We also cut it below 1951. That is what we did with the Labor Department.

I gave the figures yesterday showing how we were effectively limited in making greater cuts in appropriations for the Federal Security Agency, particularly because of legislation that ties our hands. There we went below what they had last year.

There are many things that I was personally interested in, and which I would like to have seen the committee increase. But we just could not do it under present

circumstances. I have not had a chance to talk about public health here this afternoon. If only I had my way there would be some of these national institutes, like the Heart, Cancer, Mental Health, Arthritis, Neuralagical Diseases, and Blind Institutes. If I only had my way, they would get more money because we could save lives by giving such institutes money. This year I had hoped to be able to do something for the Cancer Institute. It is cancer month now and the cancer drive is going on all over the country. I do not believe there is an uglier word in our dictionary or in our vocabulary than the word "cancer." Cancer is killing over 200,000 people a year right here in our country. I would like to have offered an amendment to increase them by \$5,000,000 for an educational program. If you men could have seen some of the people I have seen, some of them close to me, who have died from cancer, you would have gone along with me. If you had gone along with me a year ago on that raise, that would have been the greatest answer to socialized medicine that could have been made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY), there were—ayes 144, noes 100.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Jensen amendment that was just adopted.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The other amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment upon which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 39, line 8, insert a new section as follows:

"No part of any appropriations or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all such vacancies.

"(b) to positions filled from within the agency.

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

"(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service St. Elizabeths Hospital, and Freedmens Hospital.

"(e) to employees in grades CPC 1 and 2."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 208, nays 145, not voting 80, as follows:

[Roll No. 33]

YEAS—208

Aandahl	Davis, Tenn.	Johnson
Abernethy	Davis, Wis.	Jonas
Adair	Dempsey	Jones, Mo.
Allen, Calif.	Denny	Kearns
Allen, Ill.	Devereux	Keating
Andersen,	D'Ewart	Kersten, Wis.
H. Carl	Dolliver	Kilburn
Anderson, Calif.	Dondero	Latham
Andresen,	Dorn	LeCompte
August H.	Ellsworth	Lovre
Andrews	Fallon	Lucas
Angell	Fellows	McConnell
Arends	Fenton	McCulloch
Armstrong	Fernandez	McDonough
Auchincloss	Ford	McGregor
Ayres	Forrester	McMillan
Baker	Frazier	McVey
Bakewell	Fulton	Mack, Wash.
Bates, Mass.	Gamble	Martin, Iowa
Battle	Gathings	Martin, Mass.
Beall	Gavin	Mason
Beamer	Golden	Meador
Belcher	Goodwin	Merrow
Bender	Gossett	Miller, Md.
Bennett, Mich.	Graham	Morano
Berry	Gross	Morton
Betts	Gwinn	Mumma
Bishop	Hagen	Murray, Tenn.
Blackney	Hale	Nelson
Boggs, Del.	Hall	Nicholson
Bolton	Edwin Arthur	Norblad
Bow	Hall,	O'Hara
Boykin	Leonard W.	O'Konski
Bramblett	Halleck	Ostertag
Bray	Harden	Patten
Brown, Ohio	Harris	Patterson
Brownson	Harrison, Va.	Phillips
Bryson	Harrison, Wyo.	Pickett
Buffett	Harvey	Poulson
Busbey	Hébert	Radwan
Bush	Herlong	Rankin
Butler	Hertel	Reece, Tenn.
Byrnes, Wis.	Heselton	Reed, Ill.
Case	Hess	Reed, N. Y.
Chenoweth	Hill	Rees, Kans.
Church	Hillings	Ribicoff
Clevenger	Hoeben	Richards
Cole, Kans.	Hoffman, Ill.	Rivers
Cole, N. Y.	Holmes	Sadlak
Colmer	Hope	St. George
Cooper	Horan	Sasser
Corbett	Hull	Saylor
Cox	Hunter	Schwabe
Crawford	Irving	Scott, Hardie
Crumpacker	Jackson, Calif.	Scott,
Cunningham	James	Hugh D., Jr.
Curtis, Mo.	Jarman	Scrivner
Curtis, Nebr.	Jenison	Scudder
Dague	Jenkins	Seely-Brown
Davis, Ga.	Jensen	Shafer

Sheehan
Short
Sikes
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wis.
Springer
Stanley
Stefan
Taber

Talle
Thompson,
Mich.
Tollefson
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Vorys
Vursell
Weichel
Werdel
Wharton
Wheeler

NAYS—145

Addonizio
Albert
Aspinall
Baring
Barrett
Bates, Ky.
Beckworth
Bennett, Fla.
Bentsen
Blatnik
Boggs, La.
Bolling
Bonner
Bosone
Breen
Brown, Ga.
Buckley
Burnside
Byrne, N. Y.
Carlyle
Carnahan
Chatham
Chelf
Chudoff
Clemente
Combs
Cooley
CROSSER
Deane
DeGraffenried
Delaney
Denton
Dollinger
Donohue
Doyle
Durham
Eberharter
Elliott
Engle
Felghan
Fine
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Fugate
Furcolo
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon

NOT VOTING—80

Abbitt
Allen, La.
Anfuso
Bailey
Barden
Brehm
Brooks
Buchanan
Budge
Burdick
Burleson
Burton
Camp
Canfield
Cannon
Celler
Chiperfield
Cotton
Coudert
Dawson
Dingell
Donovan
Doughton
Eaton
Elston
Evins
Fisher

George
Gillette
Gore
Greenwood
Hand
Hart
Heller
Hinchshaw
Hoffman, Mich.
Judd
Kean
Kearney
Kluczynski
Larcade
Lesinski
McKinnon
Machrowicz
Miller, Nebr.
Miller, N. Y.
Morrison
Multer
Murray, Wis.
O'Toole
Passman
Potter
Powell
Prouty

Widnall
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Wilson, Ind.
Wilson, Tex.
Withrow
Wolcott
Wolverton
Wood, Ga.

Mitchell
Morgan
Morris
Moulder
Murdock
Murphy
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Neill
Patman
Perkins
Philbin
Poage
Polk
Preston
Price
Priest
Quinn
Rabaut
Ramsay
Rhodes
Riley
Robeson
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney
Roosevelt
Sabath
Secrest
Shelley
Spence
Steed
Stigler
Tackett
Teague
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Trimble
Welch
Whitaker
Whitten
Wier
Willis
Winstead
Yates
Zablocki

Mr. Chiperfield for, with Mr. Sieminski against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Heiler against.
Mr. Towe for, with Mr. Hart against.
Mr. Stockman for, with Mr. Anfuso against.
Mr. Coudert for, with Mr. Kluczynski against.

Mr. Eaton for, with Mr. Lesinski against.
Mr. Sittler for, with Mr. Dingell against.
Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. George for, with Mr. McKinnon against.
Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Yorty against.
Mr. Murray of Wisconsin for, with Mr. Wickersham against.

Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Powell against.
Mr. Hand for, with Mr. Machrowicz against.
Mr. Hinshaw for, with Mr. Celler against.
Mr. Miller of Nebraska for, with Mr. Dawson against.

Mr. Kean for, with Mr. Abbitt against.
Mr. Kearney for, with Mr. Bailey against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Raines with Mr. Brehm.
Mr. Larcade with Mr. Canfield.
Mr. Burton with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan.
Mr. Hardy with Mr. Vail.
Mr. Burleson with Mr. Miller of New York.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Cotton.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN SECTION NUMBERS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, in the engrossment of the bill just passed, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make any necessary correction in section numbers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have five legislative days to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight Friday, April 20, to file a report on the Department of the Interior appropriation for 1952.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER FROM THURSDAY TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. There will be no District business on Monday. There will be H. R. 3461, which relates to naval installations, on which a rule has been granted.

Also H. R. 3096 from the Armed Services Committee relating to acquisition and disposition of land and interest in land by the Army and other branches of the Department of Defense.

Then there will be general debate on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

If there are any roll calls, it is understood that they will be put over until Tuesday.

On Tuesday will be a continuation, under the 5-minute rule, of the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday are undetermined at the present time.

I have been informed that sometime during next week the supplementary appropriation for the military will be reported out. If so, it will be taken up.

Any other program for next week I will announce to the House as soon as I possibly can.

Of course, conference reports, if any, may be brought up at any time.

AMENDING THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

(Mr. CROSSER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, on April 12, 1951, I introduced the bill (H. R. 3669) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act.

I am at this time introducing another bill 3755 to amend the Railroad Retirement Act in order that there may be a proposal setting forth legislation suggested by 4 of the 22 railway labor organizations, through their respective chiefs who did not join in proposing H. R. 3669, which was proposed and urged by 18 of the 22 chiefs, speaking for their 18 railway labor organizations.

As soon as the hearings now scheduled before the committee have been completed, we hope to have hearings at once—not only on the two measures to which I have referred, but also to receive any testimony bearing upon the other bills referred to our Committee for the purpose of amending the Railroad Retirement Act.

MINORITY VIEWS ON H. R. 2084

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Ways and Means Commit-

So the amendment was agreed to.
The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Potter for, with Mr. Greenwood against.
Mr. Taylor for, with Mr. Staggers against.
Mr. Velde for, with Mr. Walter against.
Mr. Judd for, with Mr. Sheppard against.
Mr. Elston for, with Mr. Buchanan against.
Mr. Vaughn for, with Mr. Multer against.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3709

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 19 (legislative day, APRIL 17), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related
6 independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1952, namely:

1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
4 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title
5 referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized
6 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
7 55a); purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor
8 vehicles for replacement only; teletype news service; and
9 payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for
10 dues or fees for library membership in organizations
11 whose publications are available to members only or to
12 members at a price lower than to the general public;
13 \$1,425,000.

14 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: For ex-
15 penses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$1,650,000.

16 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: For
17 expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety,
18 employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations
19 for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of
20 the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation
21 Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of
22 the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the
23 Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C.
24 159 (f) and (g)); and not to exceed \$75,000 for the

1 work of the President's Committee on National Employ
2 the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the
3 Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including purchase
4 of reports and of material for informational exhibits; and
5 expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants
6 at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of
7 Labor Standards; \$688,000.

8 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemploy-
9 ment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance
10 in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of
11 veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and
12 Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308),
13 the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army
14 Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as
15 amended, and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service
16 Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C., App. 459 (h)), and, under the
17 Act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App.
18 1472), of persons who have performed service in the
19 Merchant Marine, \$277,000.

20 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

21 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
22 the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging appren-
23 tice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937
24 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$2,692,000.

1 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
3 general administration of the employment service and un-
4 employment compensation programs, including temporary
5 employment of persons, without regard to the civil service
6 laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; for
7 cooperation with the United States Immigration and Natural-
8 ization Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and
9 carrying out agreements relating to the employment of foreign
10 agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and
11 when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force;
12 and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by
13 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
14 55a) ; \$4,635,500, of which \$743,500 shall be for carrying
15 into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602)
16 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

17 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and em-
18 ployment service administration: For grants in accordance
19 with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended
20 (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602
21 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants
22 to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security
23 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the
24 request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the
25 payment of rental for space made available to such State

1 in lieu of grants for such purpose, and for necessary expenses
2 in connection with the operation of employment office facil-
3 ities and services in the District of Columbia, \$165,560,000,
4 of which \$6,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that
5 the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs of ad-
6 ministration resulting from changes in a State law or increases
7 in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary
8 costs over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the
9 allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which
10 increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by
11 normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwith-
12 standing any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a)
13 of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of
14 Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary
15 of the Treasury for payment to each State found to
16 be in compliance with the requirements of the Act of
17 June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico
18 and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303
19 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts
20 as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient
21 administration of its unemployment compensation law and
22 of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That
23 such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department
24 of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for
25 the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly

1 determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail
2 matter in connection with the administration of unemploy-
3 ment compensation systems and employment services by
4 States receiving grants herefrom.

5 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
6 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
7 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment
8 and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis,
9 shall apply.

10 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
11 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
12 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
13 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
14 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
15 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
16 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
17 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
18 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
19 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
20 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
21 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

22 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
23 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
24 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,
25 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the

1 first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums
2 as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the
3 expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title
4 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the
5 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

6 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

7 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
8 expenses and not to exceed \$46,000 for the Employees'
9 Compensation Board of Appeals, \$1,947,000, together with
10 not to exceed \$122,000 to be derived from the War Claims
11 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of
12 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

13 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
14 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except
15 administrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing
16 during the current or any prior fiscal year, including pay-
17 ments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital
18 services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of
19 Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of bene-
20 fits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits"
21 in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947;
22 the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in
23 third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital
24 services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial
25 expenses, including transportation and other expenses inci-

1 dental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such
2 enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified
3 by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services
4 and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943,
5 and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian em-
6 ployees of the United States, and the limitations and author-
7 ity of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C.
8 796), shall apply in providing such services, treatment, and
9 expenses in such cases; \$30,000,000, together with not to
10 exceed \$5,000,000 to be derived from the War Claims
11 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of
12 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and to be available for payments
13 pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of such Act, which
14 amounts may be accounted for as one fund.

15 BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

16 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
17 work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to
18 State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for
19 services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services
20 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
21 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,243,000.

22 Revision of consumers' price index: For expenses nec-
23 essary to enable the Bureau to complete the revision of the
24 Consumers' Price Index, including temporary employees at
25 rates to be fixed by the Secretary without regard to the civil

1 service and classification laws and the Federal Employees
2 Pay Act of 1945, as amended; and services as authorized by
3 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ;
4 \$1,000,000.

5
6 WOMEN'S BUREAU

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
7 work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of
8 June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16) , including purchase of
9 reports and material for informational exhibits, \$389,000.

10 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

11 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-
12 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards
13 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide condi-
14 tions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts
15 by the United States, approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C.
16 38) , including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local
17 agencies and their employees for inspection services ren-
18 dered, and for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials
19 and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of
20 the Division, \$8,000,000.

21 GENERAL PROVISIONS

22 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for
23 salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic
24 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of

1 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for examination of esti-
2 mates of appropriations in the field, and for expenses of
3 attendance at meetings concerned with the function or
4 activity for which any such appropriation is made.

5 SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appro-
6 priation in this title may be transferred to any other
7 such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be in-
8 creased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer:
9 *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of
10 new functions within the Department.

11 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
12 Appropriation Act, 1952".

13 TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

14 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

15 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
16 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$115,000.

17 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

18 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of
19 Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services
20 and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements,
21 \$390,000.

22 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

23 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carry-
24 ing out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as

1 amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392, Public Law 459, approved
2 March 16, 1950); the Tea Importation Act, as amended
3 (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C.
4 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C.
5 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C.
6 61-64); including the purchase of not to exceed seven pas-
7 senger motor vehicles, of which two shall be for replace-
8 ment only; reporting and illustrating the results of
9 investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scien-
10 tific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment in advance
11 for special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of
12 fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new
13 developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement opera-
14 tions; \$5,345,000.

15 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-
16 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspec-
17 tion of certain products in accordance with sections 406, 504,
18 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug,
19 and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 354, 356,
20 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the advance
21 deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payment of
22 fees by applicants for certification or inspection of such prod-
23 ucts, to remain available until expended. The total amount
24 herein appropriated shall be available for personal services;

1 purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment;
2 and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has
3 been rendered.

4 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for
6 operation and maintenance, including repairs; purchase of
7 one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; furnishing,
8 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by
9 employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer
10 of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard
11 University" for salaries of technical and professional person-
12 nel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of
13 Howard University for instruction of nurses and actual cost
14 of heat, light, and power furnished by such university;
15 \$2,906,500: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician
16 receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-
17 time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages
18 or salary from any other appropriation in this title.

19 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

20 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of How-
21 ard University, including personal services and miscella-
22 neous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds,
23 \$2,525,000.

24 Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans
25 and specifications for construction, under the supervision of

1 the General Services Administration, on the grounds of
2 Howard University of a pharmacy building, including engi-
3 neering and architectural services, advertising, and travel,
4 \$55,500, to remain available until expended.

5 Construction of buildings: For construction of buildings
6 on the grounds of Howard University, under the supervision
7 of the General Services Administration, to remain available
8 until expended, as follows:

9 For construction of a pharmacy building, together with
10 alterations and installations in connection with such con-
11 struction, including engineering and architectural services,
12 and travel, \$904,500;

13 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
14 provided under this head in the First Deficiency Appropria-
15 tion Act, 1948, as amended by the Second Deficiency Ap-
16 propriation Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for construction
17 of an engineering building, \$332,000.

18 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

19 Promotion and further development of vocational edu-
20 cation: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the
21 Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section
22 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), and sec-
23 tion 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30)
24 and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462),
25 \$18,223,261: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the

1 States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall
2 be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$18,048,261 for
3 the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That no part of
4 this appropriation shall be available for vocational education
5 in distributive occupations.

6 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the
7 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22
8 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 329), \$2,480,000.

9 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
10 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations,
11 and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of
12 public and school library service; coordination of library
13 service on the national level with other forms of adult
14 education; developing library participation in Federal proj-
15 ects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials
16 among libraries, interstate library coordination and the devel-
17 opment of library service throughout the country; purchase,
18 distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-
19 picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and
20 cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles
21 of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative
22 of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education,
23 and repairing the same; \$3,253,000, of which not less than
24 \$500,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational
25 Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all receipts from

1 non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for ex-
2 penses of travel of employees of the Office of Education
3 performing advisory functions to said agencies shall be de-
4 posited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit
5 of this appropriation.

6 Payments to school districts: For payments to local
7 educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
8 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950
9 (Public Law 874), \$28,000,000.

10 Grants for school construction: For grants for emer-
11 gency school construction to school districts in feder-
12 ally affected areas as authorized by the Act of
13 September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), to remain avail-
14 able until expended, \$75,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 is
15 for payment of obligations incurred under authority provided
16 under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act,
17 1951: *Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall
18 be available for reimbursement payments under section 205
19 (c) (1) of such Act with respect to school facilities com-
20 pleted before July 1, 1951: *Provided further*, That in
21 determining relative urgency of need for purposes of pre-
22 scribing, under section 206 (d) of such Act, the order in
23 which certifications for payments from this appropriation
24 shall be made (other than payments in liquidation of con-
25 tractual obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1951), the

1 Commissioner shall give special consideration to the extent
2 to which the school facilities are needed in the interests of
3 national defense.

4 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

5 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
6 Puerto Rico) : For payments to States (including Alaska,
7 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Voca-
8 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4),
9 including payments, in accordance with regulations of the
10 Administrator, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the
11 acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accord-
12 ance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of
13 blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be con-
14 trolled by the State agency, \$20,475,000, of which not to
15 exceed \$175,000 shall be available to the Federal Security
16 Administrator for providing rehabilitation services to dis-
17 abled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by
18 section 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be available
19 for administrative expenses in connection with providing
20 such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That
21 not to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be
22 used for administrative purposes.

23 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
24 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after
25 May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in

1 accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as
2 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding
3 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding
4 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations
5 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged
6 to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*,
7 That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not
8 exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of
9 the current fiscal year.

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in car-
11 rying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation
12 Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936
13 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for
14 production, purchase, and distribution of educational films;
15 \$705,000.

16 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

17 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public
18 Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A)
19 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, includ-
20 ing (with the exception of the appropriation "Pay, and so
21 forth, commissioned officers, Public Health Service") pur-
22 chase of reports, documents, and other material for publica-
23 tion; preparation and display of posters and exhibits by con-
24 tract or otherwise; packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating,

1 drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commis-
2 sioned officers and transportation of their dependents on
3 change of station; and increased allowances to Reserve
4 officers for foreign service; as follows:

5 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
6 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
7 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
8 diagnosis, treatment, support, and clothing of persons afflicted
9 with venereal diseases; transportation and subsistence of such
10 persons and their attendants to and from the place of treat-
11 ment or allowance in lieu thereof; diagnosis and treatment
12 (including emergency treatment for other illnesses) of such
13 persons through contracts with physicians and hospitals and
14 other appropriate institutions; fees for case finding and
15 referral to such centers of voluntary patients; reasonable
16 expenses of preparing remains or burial of deceased patients;
17 recreational supplies and equipment; leasing of facilities
18 and repair and alteration of leased facilities; the purchase of
19 not to exceed fifteen passenger motor vehicles for replace-
20 ment only, and for grants of money, services, supplies,
21 equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the
22 Act, and with the approval of the respective State health
23 authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political
24 subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such

1 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
2 General may determine; \$11,700,000.

3 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
4 (b) of the Act, \$8,745,000.

5 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes
6 of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative serv-
7 ices to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make
8 field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section
9 301 of the Act; and to provide for collecting and compiling
10 mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics (including procure-
11 ment by contract of transcripts of State, municipal, and other
12 records), including the purchase of not to exceed ten pas-
13 senger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$15,960,000.

14 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-
15 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, 361,
16 and 704 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
17 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate
18 transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,
19 erection, and maintenace of portable buildings; the purchase
20 of not to exceed twenty passenger motor vehicles and two
21 aircraft for replacement only; and hire, maintenance, and
22 operation of aircraft; \$6,090,000.

23 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For
24 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out

1 those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act
2 relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental
3 health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws
4 and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out
5 the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C.
6 466-466 (j)), including purchase of not to exceed eleven
7 passenger motor vehicles, of which nine shall be for replace-
8 ment only; \$3,710,000.

9 Grants, water pollution control: For grants to carry out
10 section 8 (a) of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S.
11 C. 466-466 (j)), \$900,000, to remain available until
12 expended.

13 Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Terri-
14 tory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct,
15 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory
16 of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the inves-
17 tigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and
18 the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation
19 services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections
20 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of sub-
21 sections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth
22 in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704 of
23 the Act, including the purchase of one passenger motor
24 vehicle, and hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft,
25 \$1,234,000: *Provided*, That property of the Public Health

1 Service located in Alaska and used in carrying out the activi-
2 ties herein authorized may be transferred, without reimburse-
3 ment, to the Territory of Alaska at the discretion of the
4 Surgeon General.

5 Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio: For payment
6 of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under
7 the head "Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio," Gen-
8 eral Services Administration, in the Independent Offices
9 Appropriation Act, 1951, \$2,400,000, to remain available
10 until expended.

11 Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hos-
12 pital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as
13 amended, to remain available until expended, \$175,000,000,
14 of which \$100,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred
15 under authority heretofore granted under this head: *Pro-*
16 *vided*, That allotments under such part C to the several States
17 for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an
18 amount equal to that part of the appropriation granted herein
19 which is available for new obligations.

20 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
21 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
22 of the Act, as amended, including the purchase of not to
23 exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,
24 \$1,195,000.

1 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-
2 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8,
3 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324,
4 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the
5 Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of
6 February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm
7 products and livestock; purchase of not to exceed fifteen pas-
8 senger motor vehicles, including four ambulances, for replace-
9 ment only; and firearms and ammunition; \$30,200,000:
10 *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service establishes
11 or operates a health service program for any department or
12 agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in
13 advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

14 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
15 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing
16 the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign coun-
17 tries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with
18 section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of
19 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
20 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the
21 Public Health Service are not available, including insurance
22 of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required
23 by law of such countries; and the purchase of not to exceed

1 twelve passenger motor vehicles of which ten shall be for
2 replacement only; \$2,990,000.

3 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For
4 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-
5 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants
6 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; the
7 regulation and preparation of biologic products; the purchase
8 of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replace-
9 ment only; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visit-
10 ing scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon
11 General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of
12 adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH), cortisone, and other
13 chemical substances, and for development of other related
14 compounds; \$15,500,000.

15 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon
16 General, upon the recommendations of the National Ad-
17 visory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research
18 and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with
19 State health agencies, and other public and private non-
20 profit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradica-
21 tion of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstra-
22 tions, and grants-in-aid; for the purchase of not to exceed
23 four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and to

1 otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of
2 the Act; \$19,500,000, of which not less than \$4,625,000
3 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for
4 research and training grants incurred under authority here-
5 tofore granted under this head.

6 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for
7 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,
8 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,
9 \$10,300,000, of which not less than \$573,000 shall be avail-
10 able exclusively for payment of obligations for research and
11 training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted
12 under this head.

13 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
14 carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including
15 the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles
16 for replacement only, \$10,000,000.

17 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
18 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to
19 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
20 diseases and conditions, \$1,500,000.

21 Construction of research facilities: For construction of
22 research facilities, to be transferred (except such part as may
23 be necessary for incidental expenses and purchase of equip-
24 ment by the Public Health Service) to the General Services

1 Administration, and to remain available until expended, as
2 follows:

3 For continuation of construction of a combined hospital
4 and research building as authorized under this head in the
5 Federal Security Agency Appropriation Acts of 1949 and
6 1950, \$10,400,000, of which \$10,000,000 is for payment of
7 obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under
8 this head.

9 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
10 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of
11 auxiliary service area structures, as authorized under this
12 head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
13 1950, \$300,000.

14 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
15 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of
16 additional auxiliary structures as authorized under this
17 head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act.
18 1951, \$350,000.

19 For purchase and installation of additional equipment,
20 supplies, and furnishings for structures heretofore provided
21 under this head, \$6,640,000.

22 Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth: For pay, uni-
23 forms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for
24 foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed

1 one thousand five hundred regular active commissioned
2 officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular
3 and reserve commissioned officers; for payment of claims for
4 private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or
5 damaged in the military service of the United States, as
6 authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 222c, h; 42 U. S. C. 213) ;
7 and for six months' death gratuity pay and burial payments
8 for regular commissioned officers; \$1,790,000, and the Sur-
9 geon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation
10 from appropriations made available to the Public Health
11 Service for the current fiscal year such additional amounts as
12 may be necessary for pay and allowances of the officers
13 herein authorized.

14 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the
15 Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses
16 of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere,
17 including conducting research on technical nursing standards
18 and furnishing consultative nursing services; preparing in-
19 formation, articles, and publications related to public health;
20 conducting studies and demonstrations in public health
21 methods; carrying on international health activities, including
22 not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other
23 countries when specifically authorized by the Surgeon Gen-
24 eral; and purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor
25 vehicles for replacement only; \$2,850,000.

1 SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
3 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including purchase
4 of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for re-
5 placement only, clothing for patients and cooperation with
6 organizations or individuals in scientific research into the
7 nature, causes, prevention, and treatment of mental illness,
8 \$2,135,000.

9 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:
10 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and
11 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prepa-
12 ration of plans and specifications, advertising, and super-
13 vision of construction, \$136,500, to remain available until
14 expended: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may
15 be transferred to the General Services Administration.

16 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

17 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions:
18 For expenses necessary for the supervision of Federal credit
19 unions, \$175,000, together with the aggregate of amounts
20 received from certificate, supervision, and examination fees
21 collected from Federal credit unions as authorized by law.

22 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Sur-
23 vivors Insurance: For necessary expenses, including pur-
24 chase of four passenger motor vehicles; and furnishing,
25 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment

1 used by building guards; not more than \$58,000,000 may
2 be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insur-
3 ance trust fund.

4 Reimbursement to Federal old-age and survivors in-
5 surance trust fund: For reimbursement to the Federal old-
6 age and survivors insurance trust fund for administrative
7 costs and for benefits paid during the period July 1, 1949
8 through August 31, 1950 to the survivors of veterans of
9 World War II eligible for benefits as provided under section
10 210 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C.
11 410), \$3,734,000.

12 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
13 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children,
14 aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally
15 disabled, as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the
16 Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7,
17 subch. I, IV, and X, 64 Stat. 477), \$1,250,000,000, of
18 which such amount as may be necessary shall be available
19 for grants for any period in the prior fiscal year subsequent
20 to March 31 of that year.

21 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance:
22 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
23 \$1,463,400.

24 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
25 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as

1 amended (29 U. S. C. 18a), and title V of the Social Security
2 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including
3 purchase of reports and material for the publications of the
4 Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution, \$1,450,-
5 000: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation con-
6 tained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry
7 out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care
8 of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons
9 licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided*
10 *further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed
11 as to prevent any patient from having the services of any
12 practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so
13 long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*, That
14 any State plan which provides standards for professional
15 obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State
16 shall be approved.

17 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
18 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-
19 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as au-
20 thorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
21 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
22 \$30,000,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State
23 pursuant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall
24 not be included in computing for the purposes of subsections
25 (a) and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount

1 expended or estimated to be expended by the State: *Pro-*
2 *vided further*, That this appropriation shall be allotted on a
3 pro rata basis among the several States in proportion to the
4 amounts to which the respective States are entitled for the
5 current fiscal year by reason of section 331 of the Social
6 Security Act Amendments of 1950.

7 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
8 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for
9 Social Security, \$219,700, together with not to exceed
10 \$110,300 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and
11 survivors insurance trust fund.

12 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
13 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments
14 to States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respec-
15 tively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first
16 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may
17 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures
18 made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to
19 be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

20 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
21 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
22 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter
23 in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
24 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to
25 a State plan approved under such title prior to or during

1 such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect
2 to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which
3 such plan was submitted for approval.

4 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

5 Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office of
6 the Administrator, \$2,050,000, together with not to ex-
7 ceed \$403,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age
8 and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the
9 Administrator may advance to this appropriation from ap-
10 propriations of constituent organizations of the Federal
11 Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to finance
12 the regional office activities of such constituent organizations.

13 Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:
14 For expenses necessary for the Office of the Administrator,
15 including salaries for the Division of Service Operations; and
16 purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement
17 only; \$711,500, together with not to exceed \$123,500 to
18 be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors in-
19 surance trust fund: *Provided*, That the Administrator may
20 advance to this appropriation from appropriations of con-
21 stituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such
22 sums as may be necessary to cover the charges for services,
23 supplies, equipment, and materials furnished.

24 Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Salaries, Office of
25 the General Counsel, \$412,000, together with not to exceed

1 \$22,950 to be transferred from the appropriation "Salaries
2 and expenses, certification and inspection services", and not
3 to exceed \$389,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-
4 age and survivors insurance trust fund.

5 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for
6 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)
7 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of
8 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal
9 excess property for educational purposes and protection of
10 public health, \$100,000.

11 GENERAL PROVISIONS

12 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
13 salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of
14 estimates of appropriations in the field, and for payment
15 in advance when authorized by the Federal Security Ad-
16 ministrator for dues or fees for library membership in
17 organizations whose publications are available to members
18 only or to members at a price lower than to the general
19 public.

20 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
21 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
22 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
23 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

24 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available
25 for salaries and expenses shall be available for travel ex-

1 penses and for expenses of attendance at meetings con-
2 cerned with the function or activity for which any such ap-
3 propriation is made.

4 SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this
5 title to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid
6 of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
7 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses
8 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld
9 from the said agencies of any States which have established
10 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit sys-
11 tem and classification and compensation plan covering the
12 selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their em-
13 ployees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the
14 manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States,
15 or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

16 This title may be cited as the "Federal Security
17 Agency Appropriation Act, 1952".

18 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS

19 BOARD

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
21 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
22 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
23 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including
24 expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work
25 of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman

1 or the General Counsel; and services as authorized by section
2 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
3 \$8,000,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation
4 shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agri-
5 cultural laborers or used in connection with investigations,
6 hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units
7 composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section
8 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as
9 amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947,
10 and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938
11 (52 Stat. 1060).

12 This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations
13 Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

14 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

15 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
16 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
17 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
18 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$400,000.

19 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses nec-
20 essary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of
21 the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157),
22 and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant
23 to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including

1 stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
2 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$150,000.

3 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
5 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
6 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
7 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$600,000, of which not
8 less than \$250,000 shall be available for compensation
9 (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of
10 referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway
11 Labor Act, as amended.

12 This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board
13 Appropriation Act, 1952".

14 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

15 Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual
16 premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions,
17 and death benefits, in accordance with the provisions of the
18 Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended
19 (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the
20 Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said Acts
21 as specifically provided for under this title, for crediting to
22 the railroad retirement account, an amount equal to amounts
23 covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during the cur-
24 rent fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act
25 (28 U. S. C. 1500-1538).

1 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
2 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
3 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of at-
4 tendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board
5 when specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic
6 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
7 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$5,268,000, to be
8 derived from the railroad retirement account.

9 This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement
10 Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

11 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND
12 CONCILIATION SERVICE

13 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
14 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
15 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180,
16 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
17 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-
18 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor
19 relations at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem; expenses of
20 attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial
21 relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the
22 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$2,949,000.

23 Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay neces-
24 sary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the Presi-
25 dent pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management

1 Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176-180, 182), includ-
2 ing services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
3 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of
4 Columbia, \$50,000.

5 This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and
6 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1952".

7 TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

8 SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in
9 this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
10 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
11 the United States or who is a member of an organization
12 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
13 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
14 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
15 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
16 force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an
17 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the
18 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions
19 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of
20 the United States, is not a member of an organization of
21 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against
22 the Government of the United States, or that such person
23 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
24 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
25 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That

1 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
2 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
3 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
4 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
5 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
6 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
7 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
8 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained
9 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,
10 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not
11 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the
12 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
13 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

14 SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in
15 this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes
16 not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

17 SEC. 703. No part of any appropriations or authoriza-
18 tions contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensa-
19 tion of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position
20 which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning
21 on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not
22 apply—

23 (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all such
24 vacancies.

25 (b) to positions filled from within the agency.

1 (c) to offices or positions required by law to be
2 filled by appointment of the President by and with the
3 advice and consent of the Senate.

4 (d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel,
5 including orderlies, in the Public Health Service; St.
6 Elizabeths Hospital and Freedmen's Hospital.

7 (e) to employees in grades C. P. C. 1 and 2.

8 SEC. 704. This Act may be cited as the "Labor-Federal
9 Security Appropriation Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives April 18, 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

APRIL 19 (legislative day, APRIL 17), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

JUNE 6, 1951.—Ordered to be printed, under authority of the order of the Senate
of JUNE 5 (legislative day, MAY 17), 1951

Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted
the following

REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3709]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made:

Amount of bill as passed House	\$2, 641, 206, 361
Amount of decrease by Senate committee (net)	112, 867, 530
Amount of bill as reported to Senate	2, 528, 338, 831
Amount of appropriations, 1951	2, 437, 192, 064
Amount of estimates for 1952	2, 744, 253, 760
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Over the appropriations for 1951	91, 146, 767
Under the estimates for 1952	215, 914, 929

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY TABLE

The table following shows the over-all action, setting forth the 1951 comparable appropriations, the 1952 budget estimates, the amounts allowed by the House, and the amounts recommended by the committee.

Agency	1951 appropriation (adjusted)	1952 budget estimate	House allowance	Senate committee recommendation	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—					
					1951 appropriation		Budget estimate		House allowance	
					Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Department of Labor.....	\$230,906,360	\$231,289,000	\$223,506,500	\$223,536,601	\$-7,369,759	3.19	-\$7,752,399	3.35	+\$30,101	0.01
Federal Security Agency.....	1,755,220,080	1,886,887,260	1,792,550,861	1,729,799,865	-25,420,215	1.44	-157,087,395	8.32	-62,750,996	3.50
National Labor Relations Board.....	8,562,500	8,582,500	8,000,000	8,233,959	-328,541	3.83	-348,541	4.06	+233,959	2.92
National Mediation Board.....	1,498,500	1,198,000	1,150,000	1,138,247	-360,253	24.04	-59,753	4.98	-11,753	1.02
Railroad Retirement Board.....	438,004,924	613,000,000	613,000,000	562,534,409	+124,529,485	28.43	-50,465,591	8.23	-50,465,591	8.23
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	2,999,700	3,297,000	2,999,000	3,095,750	+96,050	3.20	-201,250	6.10	+96,750	3.22
Total.....	2,437,192,064	2,744,253,760	2,641,206,361	2,528,338,831	+91,146,767	3.73	-215,914,929	7.86	-112,867,530	4.27

GENERAL STATEMENT

The committee recommends a total of \$2,528,338,831, a reduction of \$112,867,530 under the House allowance, and \$215,914,929 under the 1952 budget estimates, but \$91,146,767 more than the 1951 appropriations. The substantial increase over the 1951 appropriations results partially from the abandonment of contract authority—there was provided \$100,000,000 in contractual obligational authority for the hospital and school construction programs during the current fiscal year but for which fiscal year 1952 new obligational authority in the form of cash is provided. Another major factor in the increase is the additional allowance for payment to the railroad retirement account, \$124,529,485 more than the 1951 appropriation, but with respect to which the Congress has little effective control, the appropriation being the estimated net tax collections under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, adjusted for prior payments.

Over the past several years there has been a movement under way to merge appropriation accounts; to remove limitations, and prescriptions with reference to the use of funds, predicated on the premise that the departments would be able to do a better administrative job and with the implied assurance that the Congress could rely upon strict observance of the justifications and explanations of estimates.

The attention of the committee has been directed to instances in which funds appropriated for particular purposes have been diverted to other purposes, and to instances of fund transfers and use directly contrary to the express instructions of Congress as embodied in committee report.

If this is permitted to continue, the taking of testimony in support of the justifications is a fruitless and meaningless task. To preclude such violations of congressional intent the committee has two possible courses of action. It can write a general prohibition against deviations from approved justifications for obligations, or it can so detail its appropriations for specific objects that deviations will not be possible. The committee at this time does not wish to resort to either of these two courses. It is therefore the sense of the committee that the executive agencies shall keep the committee fully informed with respect to obligation of funds by activities and by objects.

The committee agreed to a proposal to reduce each appropriation by not less than 5 percent of the estimate for personal services, but not in addition to reductions already approved, and to make available with respect to each appropriation not more than 95 percent of the estimate for personal services for that purpose. The narrative reports which follow comment upon each item amended by the committee before the adoption of this proposal. Any item affected only by this proposal is not commented upon.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

The total amount recommended in the bill for the Department of Labor is \$223,536,601, a decrease of \$7,369,759 in comparison with the 1951 appropriations, a decrease of \$7,752,399 in comparison with the budget estimates, and an increase of \$30,101 in comparison with the House allowance.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends \$1,400,000, a reduction of \$75,000 below the estimate and \$25,000 below the House allowance. The committee concurs with the House report, but adds a further cut of \$25,000 in the international labor affairs activity.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends restoration of \$19,445 of the House cut to enable the Solicitor to more effectively discharge his duties pertaining to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends \$5,245,959, \$229,041 under the budget estimate, and \$610,459 more than the House allowance. This recommendation will provide \$1,513,765 for the veterans' placement service.

The committee heard extensive testimony on this matter to the effect that the House allowance of \$743,500, permitting only one representative and one clerk-stenographer in each State, was woefully inadequate, and would result in an ineffectual service. The choice was to either abolish the service entirely, or to provide sufficient funds. The committee deems the latter choice to be the more logical and accordingly has recommended this increase.

Grants to States.—For this item the committee recommends \$164,560,000, a reduction of \$1,000,000 below the House allowance and \$5,000,000 below the estimates. All of the reduction is against the contingency reserve fund, for which an estimate of \$10,000,000 was submitted. In its considered judgment the committee feels that in this era of ever-increasing employment this modest reduction will not adversely affect the program.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends \$5,371,352, an increase of \$128,352 over the House allowance, and \$563,648 under the budget estimate. The committee has disallowed any funds for the collection, analysis, and publication of statistics on foreign labor conditions, concurring in the statement in the House report that "the proposal is somewhat nebulous and hazy in regard to exactly how it will contribute effectively to our sum total of knowledge in combating communistic influences in labor forces."

The increase, together with the amount budgeted for the foreign labor conditions statistics, is provided for the construction research statistics activity, which service has won wide recognition and this committee does not feel it could agree to its virtual abandonment.

Revision of Consumers' Price Index.—The committee recommends \$1,125,000, an increase of \$125,000 over the House allowance, and \$125,000 under the budget estimate. It is the sense of the committee that the complete revision of the price index can be accomplished with the funds recommended.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends \$8,365,304, an increase of \$365,304 over the House allowance, and \$374,696 below the estimate. The estimate was predicated on a planned investigation of 7 percent of covered establishments—50,000 of 715,000. The committee recommendation will permit investigation of approximately 47,500, or 6.5 percent. During the first 6 months of this fiscal year 57 percent of the establishments checked were found to be in violation of the basic provisions of the law and in view of this condition it is believed that the number of investigations should not be materially reduced.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

The total amount recommended in the bill for the Federal Security Agency is \$1,729,799,865, a decrease of \$25,420,215 under the 1951 appropriation, a decrease of \$157,087,395 under the budget estimate, and a decrease of \$62,750,996 under the House allowance.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends \$2,631,500, a reduction of \$275,000 under the House allowance. The hospital will have available no less funds for obligation as the committee has directed the subcommittee chairman to offer from the floor, in accordance with the rules, an amendment to authorize the resumption of direct payments—estimated to amount to \$275,000 in 1952—by the District of Columbia to Freedmen's Hospital for services rendered in the treatment of District indigents, as is now done at St. Elizabeth's Hospital, and as was formerly done at Freedmen's Hospital, having been discontinued in 1946. The payments are now covered into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Vocational education grants.—The committee recommends \$20,017,760, the budget estimate, and an increase of \$1,794,499 over the House allowance, and also recommends the elimination of the provision banning use of funds for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends \$3,397,706, \$152,294 under the budget estimate, and \$144,706 more than was allowed by the House. It is the consensus of the committee that these additional funds are necessary to enable the Office of Education to properly guide the program for assistance in federally affected areas.

Payments to school districts.—The committee recommends \$40,000,000, an increase of \$12,000,000 over the House allowance for which the Senate received a supplemental estimate, Senate Document No. 40, on May 21, together with a language change, to correct an inaccuracy in the estimate and to permit the use of funds in carrying out the provisions of section 6 of Public Law 874.

Public Law 874 provides that if the appropriations are inadequate to fully meet the entitlements, the payment to each eligible school

district must be reduced proportionately. During the current fiscal year the appropriation has met only 68 percent of the entitlements and each eligible school district has received only 68 percent of its entitlement. The increase approved by the committee is to more adequately meet the Federal share of school maintenance and operation in the federally affected areas.

School construction.—The committee recommends a substitute provision for this item, in accordance with a supplemental estimate, Senate Document No. 26, necessary to permit the use of funds for the direct provision of school facilities as authorized by sections 203 and 204 of Public Law 815.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Payments to States.—The committee recommends \$21,500,000, an increase of \$1,025,000 over the House allowance, and \$1,500,000 under the budget estimate. The committee feels that the program should not be curtailed and accordingly has recommended an additional \$1,025,000. It is the sense of the committee that the amount disallowed should be taken out of the counseling, guidance, and placement services and not from the purchase of case services.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The committee has recommended total appropriations of \$358,921,555, an increase of \$19,667,555 over the House allowances, a decrease of \$3,771,445 under the budget estimates and an increase of \$84,127,275 over 1951 appropriations.

The substantial increase over 1951 appropriations results principally from the providing of new obligational authority by appropriation rather than by contract authority for the hospital construction program, offset somewhat by the decrease of \$20,000,000 for liquidation of prior years' contract authority.

The committee had for its consideration numerous requests, by both official and public witnesses, for substantial increases in appropriations. Prominent medical and lay authorities appeared in support of the citizens' budgets.

The committee has recommended the budget estimates for activities in the categorical institutes—for cancer, mental health, heart, and dental health. There was sentiment for substantial increases over the estimates, the consensus being that more liberal allowances could result in accomplishments in the detection, treatment, and cure of these diseases. With this realization the committee with reluctance denied the proposals for allowances in excess of the budget estimates. It was felt that cognizance must be taken of the plight of the American taxpayer whose net available funds will be lower in fiscal 1952 than in fiscal 1951.

The administrative costs of the Public Health Service have risen year by year and the committee suggests to the Surgeon General that attention be given to effecting economy in this program.

Venereal diseases.—The committee recommends \$11,653,360, \$146,640 under the budget estimate, and \$46,640 less than was allowed by the House. Officials of the Public Health Service informed the committee that if less than the budget estimate were allowed many States

and local health authorities would be forced to release essential personnel in laboratories and in clinics and in the case-finding activities. As pointed out in the House report, the most important activity is case finding and the committee is reluctant to curtail this activity.

Tuberculosis.—The committee recommends \$8,887,351, an increase of \$142,351 over the House allowance, and \$112,649 below the budget estimate. It is in full accord with the House report that "sustained support is essential if further progress is to be made and gains are not to be lost." It accordingly recommends this increase for grants to States, and suggests to the Public Health Service that continued stress be given the mobile X-ray units.

Hospital construction, grants to States.—The committee recommends \$195,000,000, of which \$100,000,000 is for liquidation of prior years' contract authority, \$20,000,000 under the budget estimate, and \$95,000,000 is for new obligational authority, \$20,000,000 more than the budget estimate, and \$20,000,000 more than was allowed by the House.

The substantive law authorized \$150,000,000 yearly for grants to States for hospital construction. While the budget estimate was 50 percent of the authorization, the increased cost of materials and construction would result in only 30 percent of new beds in comparison with estimated beds to be provided with the maximum authorization at the time of the passage of the law.

In considering the need for funds for hospital construction, the committee has kept in mind the purposes originally envisioned and feels it appropriate to emphasize that section 622 (d) of the Public Health Service Act spells out the specific intent that the States shall give "special consideration to hospitals serving rural communities and areas with relatively small financial resources." The most consistent efforts should be made, therefore, to place the emphasis in the granting of applications on the needs of the smaller rural communities before attempting the construction of large-scale medical centers in populous areas already served by competent hospital facilities.

National Institutes of Health.—The committee recommends \$15,559,973, an increase of \$59,973 over the House allowance and \$240,027 under the budget estimate. The committee feels that none of the reduction should be applied against research and training, but should be taken out of administration and review and approval of research and training grants.

National Cancer Institute.—The committee recommends \$19,805,171, \$141,829 under the budget estimate, and an increase of \$305,171 over the House allowance. In recommending the budget estimate and an increase over the House allowance the committee has had in mind that "authorities agree that the key to ultimate success lies in further research" as so aptly pointed out in the House report and in consequence feels compelled to allow the full budget estimate.

Mental health activities.—The committee recommends \$10,737,974, \$62,026 under the budget estimate, and an increase of \$437,974 over the House allowance. The testimony presented to the committee is replete with evidence of need for support of this program on a continuing basis, and there is much to support more liberal allowances.

National Heart Institute.—The committee recommends \$10,072,982, \$77,018 under the budget estimate, and \$72,982 more than was allowed by the House. The additional allowance will permit the financing of

continuing research projects and corollary work in direct research in the effort to attain advances in the detection and successful treatment of this primary cause of death.

Dental health activities.—The committee recommends \$1,697,308, \$52,692 under the budget estimate, and an increase of \$197,308 over the House allowance. The committee feels that there should be no precipitate diminution of activity in the program to promote the topical fluoride treatment of children's teeth.

Construction of research facilities.—The committee recommends \$16,630,540, a decrease of \$1,059,460 under the House allowance. This reduction is partially made by the disallowance of \$100,000 sought for liquidation cash in connection with housing construction, and by the transfer of \$955,000, previously appropriated for housing construction, for continuation of construction of a combined hospital and research building.

Commissioned officers, pay and so forth.—The committee recommends \$1,861,500, \$38,500 under the budget estimate, and \$71,500 more than was allowed by the House, which will permit the retention of officers in the immediate office of the Surgeon General.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Bureau of Federal credit unions.—The committee recommends \$167,650, \$32,350 under the budget estimate, and \$7,350 less than was allowed by the House, and \$82,350 under the 1951 appropriation. The Bureau has shown progress in attaining a self-supporting status and has had submitted to the Congress a draft of legislation to increase charges for chartering and establishing Federal credit unions. The committee is hopeful that the Bureau will be given authority to increase their charges for chartering and establishing so that the need for appropriations will vanish.

Grants to States for public assistance.—The committee recommends \$1,150,000,000, a reduction of \$100,000,000 under the House allowance, \$150,000,000 under the budget estimate, and \$130,000,000 under the 1951 appropriation.

It is conservatively estimated that there will be unobligated \$80,000,000 of the current year's appropriation. There is no information available to the committee that the new fiscal year will see a fall in the employment rolls nor a lack of job opportunities. It is believed that the committee's recommendation will fully provide for the Federal Government's obligation in this program.

The growing public dissatisfaction with the granting of relief payments to individuals for whom family care is available was called to the attention of the committee. State legislatures have indicated an awareness of the problem and the committee will expect to observe an awareness on the part of officials of the Bureau of Public Assistance to the end that relief payments are not profligately expended. It is believed that a sterner attitude might result in considerable economy in this program, without denying a single case of bona fide need.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance.—The committee recommends \$1,600,000, an increase of \$136,600 over the House allowance, and \$98,000 under the budget estimate. The committee approves this additional allowance to enable the Bureau to maintain the present year's staff and to add a few additional employees, with

the hope that full recognition will be taken of the committee's desire for a demonstration of concern over the disbursement of Federal moneys for suspect relief.

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau.—The committee recommends \$1,500,000, an increase of \$50,000 over the House allowance, and \$92,000 under the budget estimate. The committee recommendation will permit the retention of the current year's staff, but results in the complete elimination of the 19 new positions requested.

Grants to States for maternal and child welfare.—The committee recommends \$33,000,000, the budget estimate, and \$3,000,000 more than allowed by the House. This amount is just about sufficient to carry this program at the same level as in 1951.

Office of the Commissioner.—The committee recommends a total of \$300,000, a decrease of \$30,000 under the House allowance, \$50,000 under the budget estimate, and \$60,000 under the 1951 available funds. Funds are derived from direct appropriation—for which is recommended \$200,000—and by transfer from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund—for which is recommended \$100,000.

The committee feels that the funds recommended are entirely adequate to enable the Commissioner to discharge his statutory responsibilities and to act as a liaison between the Federal Security Administrator and the Social Security Administration, to each of which constituent bureaus adequate funds have been provided for planning and operation.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries.—The committee recommends a total of \$2,563,000, an increase of \$110,000 over the House allowance, a decrease of \$269,000 under the budget estimate, and \$160,700 under the 1951 appropriation. Funds are derived from direct appropriation—for which \$2,150,000 is recommended—and by transfer from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund—for which is recommended \$413,000, the budget estimate.

The amount recommended will provide a staff of 584, a reduction of 57 under the budget estimate, and 42 under the current year's authorized staff. The principal reductions are in the office of publications and reports and in the departmental merit system staff.

Funds are provided for a staff of 15 in the office of publications and reports, a reduction of 18. The committee has the firm conviction that an entirely adequate service can be furnished with the staff provided in this recommendation.

The recommendation provides for four employees in the Washington staff of the merit system activity whose ostensible purpose is to advise the States with respect to their merit systems. At the inception of the social security program the States needed advice and guidance in establishing merit systems, one of the prerequisites for approval of State plans to qualify for grants. The program has been running for more than 15 years and each State has its own merit system organization established. Whatever help is needed from the Federal level can be adequately furnished by the 20 field personnel representatives located in the regional offices and the 4 remaining in the Washington administrative office.

The following table outlines the allowances here recommended by activity and by both personnel and amounts.

Activity	1952 estimate		Proposed reduction		Revised allowance	
	Positions	Amount	Positions	Amount	Positions	Amount
I. Immediate Office of the Administrator.....	17	\$109,700	5	\$17,793	12	¹ \$91,907
II. Program coordination.....	17	107,600	3	17,414	14	90,186
III. Field services:						
Departmental.....	19	96,400	2	4,850	17	91,550
Federal-State relations:						
Director.....	5	33,367	5	33,367		
Audit.....	24	124,445	4	19,445	20	105,000
Merit System.....	17	82,188	13	56,138	4	26,050
Field:						
Regional Offices.....	309	1,093,600			309	1,093,600
Federal-State relations:						
Audit.....	98	506,058			98	506,058
Merit System.....	20	94,942			20	94,942
IV. Office of Publications and Reports.....	33	169,500	18	92,448	15	77,052
V. Administration:						
Executive assistant.....	3	19,399			3	19,399
Administrative Planning.....	9	50,630	1	3,685	8	46,945
Division of Budget and Finance.....	38	179,154	4	13,540	34	165,614
Division of Personnel.....	32	165,017	2	10,320	30	154,697
Total.....	641	2,832,000	57	269,000	584	2,563,000
Net reduction.....						269,000

Request:

To be appropriated..... \$2,150,000

Transfer from OASL..... 413,000

Total 1952 revised allowance..... 2,563,000

¹ Includes \$10,000 WAE employees.

Surplus property disposal.—The committee recommends \$75,000, a decrease of \$25,000 below the House allowance, \$258,000 below the budget estimate, and \$258,300 under the 1951 appropriation. The committee was deluged with importunities to allow the budget estimate but felt that the purpose for which this activity was created had been largely filled.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends \$8,233,959, an increase of \$233,959 over the House allowance, and a decrease of \$348,541 under the budget estimate. The record indicates that at present the Board is receiving on an average of 1,900 cases a month, and it is expected that the number will increase slightly in fiscal year 1952. The Board has no control over case intake, and if insufficient funds are allowed action is postponed.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends \$394,247, \$15,753 under the budget estimate and a decrease of \$5,753 under the House allowance.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Payment to railroad retirement account.—The committee recommends, as a substitute, provision for an annual specific appropriation in lieu of the annual indefinite as passed by the House, and the permanent indefinite as proposed in the budget estimate.

The committee recommendation is \$50,465,591 less than the budget estimate and the House allowance, neither of which recognized the credit outstanding for prior years' overpayment, resulting from the overestimating of net tax collections upon which figure the annual specific appropriation has been based, adjusted for prior years' experience.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses.—The committee recommends \$3,047,000, an increase of \$98,000 over the House allowance, and a decrease of \$200,000 under the budget estimate, but \$97,300 above 1951 appropriation. Taking into account elimination of space rental costs being assumed by General Services Administration, the allowance includes approximately \$119,000 for employment of additional personnel.

JENSEN AMENDMENT

The committee recommends the deletion of the Jensen amendment. The committee took action which would result in a savings comparable to that which would have been effected by the Jensen amendment, modified by further exemptions in preliminary discussions by the committee, by adopting a proposal to reduce each appropriation by not less than 5 percent of the estimate for personal services, and by adding a limitation to each appropriation specifying in specific amounts that not more than 95 percent of the amounts budgeted for personal services would be available for that purpose.

This provision has resulted in an additional savings, beyond those net reductions recommended prior to the adoption of this amendment, of \$2,318,190, and has provided a further necessary limitation upon executive agencies provided for in this bill with respect to the employment of personnel.

It is the consensus of the committee that this recommendation will effect as great a reduction as would have the Jensen amendment, but in a more practical way.

Properly administered, this action of the committee should show savings in other object classifications, and the committee will expect additional savings as a result.

SUMMARY OF INCREASES

Department of Labor:

Office of the Solicitor: Salaries and expenses-----	\$19, 445
Bureau of Employment Security: Salaries and expenses-----	610, 459
Bureau of Labor Statistics:	
Salaries and expenses-----	128, 352
Revision of Consumers' Price Index-----	125, 000
Wage and Hour Division: Salaries and expenses-----	365, 304
Total, Department of Labor-----	1, 248, 560

Federal Security Agency:

Office of Education:

Vocational education grants (George-Barden funds)-----	1, 794, 499
Salaries and expenses-----	144, 706
Payment to school districts (maintenance and operation)-----	12, 000, 000

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Payments to States-----	1, 025, 000
--	-------------

Public Health Service:

Tuberculosis-----	142, 351
Hospital construction-----	20, 000, 000
National Institutes of Health-----	59, 973
National Cancer Institute-----	305, 171
Mental health activities-----	437, 974
National Heart Institute-----	72, 982
Dental health activities-----	197, 308
Commissioned officers pay, etc-----	71, 500

Social Security Administration:

Bureau of Public Assistance: Salaries and expenses-----	136, 600
---	----------

Children's Bureau:

Salaries and expenses-----	50, 000
Grants to States, maternal and child welfare-----	3, 000, 000

Office of the Administrator: Salaries-----	100, 000
--	----------

Total, Federal Security Agency-----	39, 538, 064
-------------------------------------	--------------

National Labor Relations Board: Salaries and expenses-----	233, 959
--	----------

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Salaries and expenses-----	98, 000
--	---------

Total, all titles-----	41, 118, 583
------------------------	--------------

SUMMARY OF DECREASES

Department of Labor:

Office of the Secretary:

Salaries and expenses-----	\$25,000
Veterans' Reemployment Rights Bureau, salaries and expenses-----	11,242
Bureau of Apprenticeship: Salaries and expenses-----	113,318
Bureau of Employment Security: Grants to States, contingency reserve-----	1,000,000
Bureau of Employees' Compensation: Salaries and expenses-----	59,184
Women's Bureau: Salaries and expenses-----	9,715

Total, Department of Labor-----	1,218,459
---------------------------------	-----------

Federal Security Agency:

Columbia Institution for the Deaf: Salaries and expenses-----	15,463
Food and Drug Administration: Salaries and expenses (general)-----	172,025
Freedmen's Hospital: Salaries and expenses-----	275,000
Howard University: Salaries and expenses-----	109,916
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation: Salaries and expenses-----	29,380
Public Health Service:	
Venereal diseases-----	46,640
Communicable diseases-----	174,253
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hy- giene-----	61,842
Alaska disease and sanitation investigations and control-----	22,871
Hospital construction: Salaries and ex- penses-----	28,535
Foreign Quarantine Service-----	121,971
Construction of research facilities-----	1,059,460
Salaries and expenses, Public Health Serv- ice-----	104,132
Social Security Administration:	
Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: Salaries and expenses-----	7,350
Bureau of Public Assistance: Grants (titles I, IV, X, and XIV)-----	100,000,000
Office of Commissioner: Salaries and expenses-----	19,700
General Counsel, salaries-----	15,522
Surplus Property Disposal and Utilization-----	25,000

Total, Federal Security Agency-----	102,289,060
-------------------------------------	-------------

National Mediation Board:

Salaries and expenses-----	5,753
Arbitration and emergency boards-----	6,000

Total, National Mediation Board-----	11,753
--------------------------------------	--------

SUMMARY OF DECREASES—Continued

Railroad Retirement Board: Railroad retirement appropriated account-----	\$50,465,591
---	--------------

Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service: Boards of inquiry-----	1,250
---	-------

General Provisions:

The committee recommends the deletion of the Jensen amendment, section 703 of the bill:

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriations or authorizations contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all such vacancies.

(b) to positions filled from within the agency.

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service; St. Elizabeths Hospital and Freedmen's Hospital.

(e) to employees in grades C. P. C. 1 and 2.

Total, all titles-----	153,986,113
------------------------	-------------

RECAPITULATION

House allowances-----	2,641,206,361
-----------------------	---------------

Senate action:

Increases-----	41,118,583
----------------	------------

Decreases-----	153,986,113
----------------	-------------

Net change-----	—112,867,530
-----------------	--------------

Net, as reported to Senate-----	2,528,338,831
---------------------------------	---------------

PERMANENT APPROPRIATIONS, GENERAL AND SPECIAL FUNDS

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1951	Estimates, 1952	Increase (+), decrease (—)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Office of the Secretary: Replacement of personal property sold-----	\$2, 500	\$2, 500	-----
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY			
American Printing House for the Blind (act of June 25, 1906)-----	10, 000	10, 000	-----
Office of Education:			
Payments to States and Territories for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts (act of Mar. 4, 1907)-----	2, 550, 000	2, 550, 000	-----
Payment to States for promotion of vocational education (act of Feb. 23, 1947)-----	7, 150, 123	7, 150, 123	-----
Total, Office of Education-----	9, 700, 123	9, 700, 123	-----
Public Health Service: Operation of commissaries, hospitals, at Lexington, Ky., and Fort Worth, Tex. (act of Dec. 23, 1943)----	186, 000	187, 500	+\$1, 500
Office of the Administrator: Replacement of personal property sold--	57, 950	51, 375	--6, 575
Total permanent appropriations, Federal Security Agency--	9, 954, 073	9, 948, 998	--5, 075
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD ¹			
Railroad unemployment insurance administration fund-----	9, 800, 000	10, 000, 000	+200, 000
Total permanent appropriations, all agencies-----	19, 756, 573	19, 951, 498	+194, 925

¹ Table does not list \$33,000,000 appropriated in 1950 act for payment, however, in 1951 and 1952 to the railroad retirement account.

TRUST FUNDS

[Not a charge against general revenue]

Agency and item	Appropriated, 1951 ¹	Estimates, 1952	Increase (+), decrease (-)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR			
Bureau of Employees Compensation:			
Relief and rehabilitation, Longshoremen's and Harbor Worker's Compensation Act, as amended-----	\$40, 000	\$40, 000	-----
Relief and rehabilitation, Workmen's Compensation Act, within the District of Columbia-----	10, 000	10, 000	-----
Bureau of Labor Statistics: Special statistical work-----	15, 350	-----	-----
Total, Department of Labor-----	65, 350	50, 000	-----

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY			
American Printing House for the Blind: To promote the education of the blind, interest-----	10, 000	10, 000	-----
Public Health Service:			
Patients, benefit funds, Public Health Service Hospitals-----	1, 500	1, 500	-----
Public Health Service conditional gift funds-----	19, 000	19, 000	-----
Public Health Service unconditional gift funds-----	4, 720	27, 120	+ 22, 400

Office of Administrator: Miscellaneous trust funds, Federal Security Agency-----	679, 069	422, 000	— 257, 069
Total, Federal Security Agency-----	714, 289	479, 620	— 234, 669
Total trust funds, all agencies-----	779, 639	529, 620	— 250, 019

1 Several of the amounts are tentative estimates of amounts to be appropriated in 1951, and are therefore subject to change.

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Agency and item	Approved, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount rec- ommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill com- pared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				Authorization for 1951 as re- duced under sec. 1214	Budget esti- mates, 1952	House bill
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY								
Office of Education: Grants for emergency school construction	\$25,000,000	\$25,000,000				—\$25,000,000		
Public Health Service:								
Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, labo- ratory	2,400,000	2,400,000				—2,400,000		
Hospital construction	150,000,000	75,000,000				—75,000,000		
Construction of research facilities, Be- thesda, Md	350,000	350,000				—350,000		
Saint Elizabeths Hospital: Construction and equipment, 2 treatment buildings	3,938,000							
Total, contract authorizations	181,688,000	102,750,000				—102,750,000		

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1951, AMOUNTS AS REDUCED UNDER SEC. 1214
(GENERAL REDUCTION OF \$550,000,000 IN GENERAL APPROPRIATION ACT, 1951), ESTIMATES FOR 1952
AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED IN THE BILL FOR 1952**

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

[Figures in brackets not added in totals]

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				1951 appropriations as reduced under sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952	House bill
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY								
Salaries and expenses-----	\$1,425,823	\$1,425,823	\$1,475,000	\$1,425,000	\$1,400,000	—\$25,823	—\$75,000	—\$25,000
Solicitor's office, salaries and expenses-----	2,018,160	1,721,160	1,750,000	1,650,000	1,669,445	—51,715	—80,555	+19,445
Labor Standards, Bureau of, salaries and expenses-----	786,000	766,000	766,000	688,000	688,000	—78,000	—78,000	-----
Veterans' Reemployment Rights Bureau, salaries and expenses-----	281,000	281,000	277,000	277,000	265,758	—15,242	—11,242	—11,242
Total, Office of the Secretary-----	4,510,983	4,193,983	4,268,000	4,040,000	4,023,203	—170,780	—244,797	—16,797
BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP								
Salaries and expenses-----	2,788,000	2,776,000	2,692,000	2,692,000	2,578,682	—197,318	—113,318	—113,318
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY								
Salaries and expenses-----	5,531,000	5,531,000	5,475,000	4,635,500	5,245,959	—285,041	—229,041	+610,459
Grants to States:								
Basic appropriation-----	170,000,000	163,639,000	159,560,000	159,560,000	159,560,000	—4,079,000	-----	-----
Contingency reserve-----	8,500,000	8,500,000	10,000,000	6,000,000	5,000,000	—3,500,000	—5,000,000	—1,000,000
Subtotal, grants-----	178,500,000	172,139,000	169,560,000	165,560,000	164,560,000	—7,579,000	—5,000,000	—1,000,000
Total, Bureau of Employment Security-----	184,031,000	177,670,000	175,035,000	170,195,500	169,805,959	—7,864,041	—5,229,041	—389,541

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR—Continued

[Figures in brackets not added in totals]

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				1951 appropriations as reduced under sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952
BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION							
Salaries and expenses:							
Appropriation.....	\$1,853,777	\$1,846,777	\$1,973,000	\$1,947,000	\$1,887,816	+\$41,039	—\$85,184
War claims transfer.....	[119,000]	[119,000]	[122,000]	[122,000]	[122,000]	[+3,000]	-----
Employees' compensation fund:							
Appropriation.....	1 28,000,000	1 23,000,000	31,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+2,000,000	-----
War claims transfer.....	[5,000,000]	[5,000,000]	[5,000,000]	[5,000,000]	[5,000,000]	-----	-----
Total, Bureau of Employees' Compensation.....	1 29,853,777	1 29,846,777	32,973,000	31,947,000	31,887,816	+2,041,039	—59,184
BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS							
Salaries and expenses.....	5,720,700	5,685,700	5,935,000	5,243,000	5,371,352	—314,348	+128,352
Revision of consumers' price index.....	2,000,000	2,000,000	1,250,000	1,000,000	1,125,000	—875,000	+125,000
Total, Bureau of Labor Statistics.....	7,720,700	7,685,700	7,185,000	6,243,000	6,496,352	—1,189,348	+253,352
WOMEN'S BUREAU							
Salaries and expenses.....	399,000	389,000	396,000	389,000	379,285	—9,715	—9,715
WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION							
Salaries and expenses.....	9,344,900	8,344,900	8,740,000	8,000,000	8,365,304	+20,404	+365,304
Total, Department of Labor.....	2 238,648,300	230,906,360	231,289,000	223,506,500	223,536,601	—7,369,759	+30,101

¹ Includes \$3,000,000 pending supplemental.

² For comparability with the 1952 estimates, this includes a total of \$27,075,260 appropriated under various items in Federal Security Agency in 1951, all relating to the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, which was transferred to Labor by Reorganization Plan No. 19 of 1950, and which is included in the 1952 estimates under Labor.

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND (Grant funds (education of the blind))	\$115,000	\$115,000	\$115,000	\$115,000	\$115,000	\$115,000				
COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF Salaries and expenses	368,200	368,200	390,000	390,000	390,000	374,537	+\$6,337	-\$15,463	-\$15,463	
FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION Salaries and expenses (general)	5,466,700	5,266,700	5,395,000	5,395,000	5,345,000	5,172,975	-93,725	-222,025	-222,025	
Certification and inspection services, salaries and expenses (special)	1 [1, 049, 300]	1 [1, 049, 300]	1 [1, 049, 300]	1 [1, 049, 300]	1 [1, 049, 300]	1 [1, 049, 300]				
Total, Food and Drug Administration	5,466,700	5,266,700	5,395,000	5,395,000	5,345,000	5,172,975	-93,725	-222,025	-222,025	
FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL Salaries and expenses	2,600,000	2,595,000	2,987,000	2,987,000	2,906,500	2,631,500	+36,500	-355,500	-355,500	
HOWARD UNIVERSITY Salaries and expenses	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,575,000	2,575,000	2,525,000	2,415,084	-84,916	-159,916	-159,916	
Plans and specifications	100,000	100,000	55,500	55,500	55,500	55,500	-44,500			
Construction of buildings (appropriation)	1,662,000	1,662,000	1,236,500	1,236,500	1,236,500	1,236,500	-425,500			
Total, Howard University	4,262,000	4,262,000	3,867,000	3,867,000	3,817,000	3,707,084	-554,916	-159,916	-159,916	
OFFICE OF EDUCATION Vocational education grants (George-Barden funds)	19,977,760	19,875,760	20,017,760	20,017,760	18,223,261	20,017,760	+142,000			+1,794,499
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000	2,480,000				
Salaries and expenses	2,477,500	2,477,500	3,550,000	3,550,000	3,263,000	3,397,706	+920,206	-152,294	-152,294	+144,706
Payments to school districts (maintenance and operation)	23,000,000	23,000,000	24,000,000	24,000,000	28,000,000	40,000,000	+17,000,000			+12,000,000

¹ This is a special, indefinite appropriation, representing fees expected to be collected in 1951 and 1952 to cover costs of the services rendered.

² Includes \$12,000,000 submitted in Senate Document No. 40.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—Continued

[Figures in brackets not added in totals]

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				1951 appropriations as reduced under sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952	House bill
OFFICE OF EDUCATION—continued								
Grants for surveys and school construction:								
Appropriation.....	\$74,500,000	\$74,500,000	\$75,000,000	\$75,000,000	\$75,000,000	+\$500,000		
Contract authority.....	[25,000,000]	[25,000,000]				[—25,000,000]		
Total, Office of Education.....	122,435,260	122,333,260	141,047,760	126,956,261	140,895,466	+18,562,206	—\$152,294	+\$13,939,205
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION								
Payments to States.....	20,600,000	20,600,000	23,000,000	20,475,000	21,500,000	+900,000	—1,500,000	+1,025,000
Salaries and expenses.....	705,000	705,000	705,000	705,000	675,620	—29,380	—29,380	—29,380
Total, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation.....	21,305,000	21,305,000	23,705,000	21,180,000	22,175,620	+870,620	—1,529,380	+995,620
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE								
Veneral diseases.....	14,500,000	12,863,500	11,800,000	11,700,000	11,653,360	—1,210,140	—146,640	—46,640
Tuberculosis.....	9,800,000	9,400,000	9,000,000	8,745,000	8,887,351	—512,649	—112,649	+142,351
Assistance to States, general.....	16,915,000	16,084,000	16,084,000	15,960,000	15,960,000	—124,000	—124,000	
Communicable diseases.....	6,510,600	6,260,600	6,150,000	6,090,000	5,915,747	—344,853	—234,253	—174,253
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene.....	3,670,030	3,670,030	3,800,000	3,710,000	3,648,158	—21,872	—151,842	—61,842
Water-pollution-control grants.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	900,000	900,000	—100,000	—100,000	

[illegible]

³ Includes \$50,000,000 in pending Third Supplemental.

⁴ Includes \$100,000 supplemental in H. Doc. 66.

* Includes \$100,000 supplemental in H. Doc. 86.
 † Transferred from General Services Administration by Reorganization Plan No. 16 of 1950.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—Continued

[Figures in brackets not added in totals]

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				Appropriations, 1951 as reduced by sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE—continued							
Commissioned officers, pay, etc.....	\$1,790,000	\$1,790,000	\$1,900,000	\$1,790,000	\$1,861,500	+\$71,500	-\$38,500
Salaries and expenses, Public Health Service.....	2,918,000	2,868,000	2,868,000	2,850,000	2,745,868	-122,132	-122,132
Total, Public Health Service.....	282,231,315	274,794,280	362,693,000	339,254,000	358,921,555	+\$84,127,275	-3,771,445
ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL							
Salaries and expenses.....	2,005,000	2,005,000	2,135,000	2,135,000	2,135,000	+\$130,000	-----
Construction and equipment, infirmary building.....	100,000	100,000	-----	-----	-----	-100,000	-----
Miscellaneous construction and replacements.....	406,000	406,000	136,500	136,500	136,500	-269,500	-----
Construction and equipment, 2 treatment buildings:							
Appropriation.....	1,500,000	100,000	-----	-----	-----	-100,000	-----
Contract authority.....	[3,938,000]	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital.....	4,011,000	2,611,000	2,271,500	2,271,500	2,271,500	-339,500	-----
SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION							
Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, salaries and expenses:							
General fund appropriation.....	250,000	250,000	200,000	175,000	167,650	-82,350	-32,350
Annual indefinite (fces).....	6 [505,402]	6 [505,402]	6 [598,000]	6 [598,000]	[598,000]	[+92,598]	-----
							-7,350

Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance:								
Salaries and expenses (trust fund limitation)-----	[56, 988, 000]	[56, 988, 000]	[60, 000, 000]	[58, 000, 000]	[57, 437, 980]	+ [449, 980]	- [2, 562, 020]	- [562, 020]
Reimbursement to OASI trust fund-----	3, 694, 000	3, 694, 000		3, 734, 000	3, 734, 000	+ 40, 000		
Bureau of Public Assistance:								
Grants (titles I, IV, X, and XIV)-----	1, 280, 000, 000	1, 280, 000, 000	1, 300, 000, 000	1, 250, 000, 000	1, 150, 000, 000	- 130, 000, 000	- 150, 000, 000	- 100, 000, 000
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 463, 400	1, 463, 400	1, 698, 000	1, 463, 400	1, 600, 000	+ 136, 600	- 98, 000	+ 136, 600
Children's Bureau:								
Salaries and expenses-----	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 592, 000	1, 450, 000	1, 500, 000		- 92, 000	+ 50, 000
Grants to States, maternal and child welfare-----	30, 250, 000	30, 250, 000	33, 000, 000	30, 000, 000	33, 000, 000	+ 2, 750, 000		+ 3, 000, 000
Office of Commissioner, salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation-----	248, 000	248, 000	233, 000	219, 700	200, 000	+ 48, 000	- 33, 000	- 19, 700
Transfer from OASI trust fund-----	[112, 000]	[112, 000]	[117, 000]	[110, 300]	[100, 000]	{ - 12, 000}	- [17, 000]	- [10, 300]
Total, Social Security Administration-----	1, 317, 405, 400	1, 317, 405, 400	1, 340, 457, 000	1, 287, 042, 100	1, 190, 201, 650	- 127, 203, 750	- 150, 255, 350	- 96, 840, 450
OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR								
Salaries, Office of Administrator:								
Appropriation-----	2, 364, 800	2, 364, 800	2, 419, 000	2, 050, 000	2, 150, 000	- 214, 800	- 269, 000	+ 100, 000
Transfer from OASI-----	[358, 900]	[358, 900]	[413, 000]	[403, 000]	[413, 000]	+ [54, 100]		{ + 10, 000}
Service operations, salaries and expenses:								
Appropriation-----	1, 047, 600	1, 047, 600	780, 000	711, 500	711, 500	- 336, 100	- 68, 500	
Transfer from OASI-----	[191, 600]	[191, 600]	[135, 000]	[123, 500]	[123, 500]	- [68, 100]	- [11, 500]	
General Counsel, salaries:								
Appropriation-----	418, 540	418, 540	427, 000	412, 000	396, 478	- 22, 062	- 30, 522	- 15, 522
Transfers (Food and Drug and OASI)-----	[405, 895]	[405, 895]	[423, 950]	[411, 950]	[411, 950]	- [6, 055]	- [12, 000]	
Surplus property disposal and utilization-----	333, 300	333, 300	333, 000	100, 000	75, 000	- 258, 300	- 258, 000	- 25, 000
Total, Office of Administrator-----	4, 164, 240	4, 164, 240	3, 959, 000	3, 273, 500	3, 332, 978	- 831, 262	- 625, 022	+ 59, 478
Total appropriations, Federal Security Agency-----								
	1, 764, 364, 115	1, 755, 220, 080	1, 886, 887, 260	1, 792, 550, 861	1, 729, 799, 865	- 25, 420, 215	- 157, 087, 395	- 62, 750, 996

• Represents estimate of feces expected to be collected.

⁶ Represents estimate of fees expected to be collected.
⁷ Consists of a total of \$1,739,357,000 appropriated to date to the Agency, adjusted as follows for transfers or shifts in functions and activities in order to place the 1951 amounts on a basis comparable with the 1952 budget estimates: \$2,202,285 transferred from General Services Administration under Reorganization Plan 16 of 1950; \$50,000 from Agriculture in connection with studies of effects of insecticides, etc., on human health; \$200,000 transferred to Agriculture in connection with research on plant sources of ACTH and Compound X; and a total of \$27,075,260 transferred to Labor under Reorganization Plan 19 of 1950, relating to the Bureau of Employees Compensation.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951), estimates for 1952 and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952—Continued

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

[Figures in brackets not added in total]

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—) compared with	
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				Appropriations, 1951 as reduced under sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952
Salaries and expenses.....	\$8,582,500	\$8,562,500	\$8,582,500	\$8,000,000	\$8,233,959	—\$328,541	—\$348,541
							+\$233,959

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses.....	\$412,200	\$409,200	\$410,000	\$400,000	\$394,247	—\$14,953	—\$15,753
Arbitration and emergency boards.....	325,000	325,000	150,000	150,000	144,000	—181,000	—6,000
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses.....	797,300	764,300	638,000	600,000	600,000	—164,300	—38,000
Total, National Mediation Board.....	1,534,500	1,498,500	1,198,000	1,150,000	1,138,247	—360,253	—59,753
							—11,753

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Railroad retirement appropriated account:							
Annual specific amount.....	\$457,832,724	\$438,004,924			\$562,534,409	+\$124,529,485	+\$562,534,409
Permanent indefinite amount.....							—613,000,000
Salaries and expenses (transfer from railroad retirement trust fund).....	[5,446,000]	[5,446,000]	[5,268,000]	[5,268,000]	[5,056,904]	[—389,096]	[—211,096]
Total, Railroad Retirement Board.....	\$457,832,724	\$438,004,924	\$613,000,000	\$613,000,000	562,534,409	+124,529,485	—50,465,591

TITLE VI--FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses-----	\$2,949,700	\$2,949,700	\$3,247,000	\$2,949,000	\$3,047,000	+\$97,300	-\$200,000	+\$98,000
Boards of inquiry-----	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	48,750	-1,250	-1,250	-1,250
Total, Federal Mediation and Concili- ation Service-----	2,999,700	2,999,700	3,297,000	2,999,000	3,095,750	+\$96,050	-201,250	+\$96,750
Grand total appropriations, all titles of bill-----	2,473,961,899	2,437,192,064	2,744,253,760	2,641,206,361	2,528,338,831	+\$91,146,767	-215,914,929	-112,867,530

* Does not include \$33,000,000 appropriated in 1950 act for the year 1951, for military service credits.

† Does not include \$33,000,000 for 1952 carried in the 1950 act.

○

Calendar No. 363

82^D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3709

[Report No. 386]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 19 (legislative day, APRIL 17), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 6, 1951

Reported, under authority of the order of the Senate of June 5 (legislative day, May 17), 1951, by Mr. CHAVEZ, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related
6 independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1952, namely:

1 TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

2 OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

3 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
4 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title
5 referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized
6 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
7 55a); purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor
8 vehicles for replacement only; teletype news service; and
9 payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for
10 dues or fees for library membership in organizations,
11 whose publications are available to members only or to
12 members at a price lower than to the general public;
13 ~~\$1,425,000~~ \$1,400,000, of which not more than \$1,250,136
14 shall be available for personal services.

15 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: For ex-
16 penses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, ~~\$1,650,000~~
17 \$1,669,445, of which not more than \$1,530,546 shall be
18 available for personal services.

19 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: For
20 expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety,
21 employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations
22 for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of
23 the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation
24 Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of

1 the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the
2 Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C.
3 159 (f) and (g)); and not to exceed \$75,000 for the
4 work of the President's Committee on National Employ-
5 the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the
6 Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including purchase
7 of reports and of material for informational exhibits; and
8 expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants
9 at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of
10 Labor Standards; \$688,000, *of which not more than*
11 *\$604,870 shall be available for personal services.*

12 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemploy-
13 ment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance
14 in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of
15 veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and
16 Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308),
17 the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army
18 Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as
19 amended, and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service
20 Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C., App. 459 (h)), and, under the
21 Act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App.
22 1472), of persons who have performed service in the
23 Merchant Marine, ~~\$277,000~~ \$265,758, *of which not more*
24 *than \$213,603 shall be available for personal services.*

1 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
3 the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging appren-
4 tice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937
5 (29 U. S. C. 50), ~~\$2,692,000~~ \$2,578,682, of which not
6 more than \$2,153,049 shall be available for personal services.

7 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

8 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
9 general administration of the employment service and un-
10 employment compensation programs, including temporary
11 employment of persons, without regard to the civil service
12 laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; for
13 cooperation with the United States Immigration and Natural-
14 ization Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and
15 carrying out agreements relating to the employment of foreign
16 agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and
17 when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force;
18 and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by
19 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
20 55a) ; ~~\$4,635,500~~ \$5,245,959, of which ~~\$743,500~~ \$1,513,-
21 765 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV
22 (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act
23 of 1944 and of which not more than \$4,351,773 shall be
24 available for personal services.

25 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and em-

1 ployment service administration: For grants in accordance
2 with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended
3 (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602
4 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants
5 to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security
6 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the
7 request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the
8 payment of rental for space made available to such State
9 in lieu of grants for such purpose, and for necessary expenses
10 in connection with the operation of employment office facil-
11 ities and services in the District of Columbia, ~~\$165,560,000~~
12 \$164,560,000, of which not more than \$647,037 shall be
13 available for personal services, and of which \$6,000,000
14 \$5,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that the Sec-
15 retary finds necessary to meet increased costs of administra-
16 tion resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the
17 numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs
18 over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the
19 allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which
20 increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by
21 normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwith-
22 standing any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a)
23 of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of
24 Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary
25 of the Treasury for payment to each State found to

1 be in compliance with the requirements of the Act of
2 June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico
3 and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303
4 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts
5 as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient
6 administration of its unemployment compensation law and
7 of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That
8 such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department
9 of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for
10 the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly
11 determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail
12 matter in connection with the administration of unemploy-
13 ment compensation systems and employment services by
14 States receiving grants herefrom.

15 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
16 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
17 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment
18 and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis,
19 shall apply.

20 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
21 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
22 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
23 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
24 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
25 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-

1 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
 2 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
 3 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
 4 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner
 5 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
 6 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

7 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
 8 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
 9 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,
 10 and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the
 11 first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums
 12 as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the
 13 expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title
 14 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the
 15 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

16 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

17 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
 18 expenses and not to exceed \$46,000 for the Employees'
 19 Compensation Board of Appeals, ~~\$1,947,000~~ \$1,887,816,
 20 of which not more than \$1,618,499 shall be available for
 21 personal services, together with not to exceed \$122,000 to
 22 be derived from the War Claims Fund created by section
 23 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

24 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
 25 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except

1 administrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing
2 during the current or any prior fiscal year, including pay-
3 ments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital
4 services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of
5 Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of bene-
6 fits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits"
7 in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947;
8 the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in
9 third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital
10 services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial
11 expenses, including transportation and other expenses inci-
12 dental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such
13 enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified
14 by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services
15 and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943,
16 and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian em-
17 ployees of the United States, and the limitations and author-
18 ity of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C.
19 796), shall apply in providing such services, treatment, and
20 expenses in such cases; \$30,000,000, together with not to
21 exceed \$5,000,000 to be derived from the War Claims
22 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of
23 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and to be available for payments
24 pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of such Act, which
25 amounts may be accounted for as one fund.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~\$5,243,000~~ \$5,371,352, of which not more than \$4,530,755 shall be available for personal services.

Revision of consumers' price index: For expenses necessary to enable the Bureau to complete the revision of the Consumers' Price Index, including temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service and classification laws and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); ~~\$1,000,000~~ \$1,125,000, of which not more than \$991,323 shall be available for personal services.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, ~~\$389,000~~ \$379,285, of which not more than \$317,581 shall be available for personal services.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C. 38), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division, ~~\$8,000,000~~ \$8,365,304, of which not more than \$7,119,227 shall be available for personal services.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field, and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation in this title may be transferred to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer:

1 *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of
2 new functions within the Department.

3 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
4 Appropriation Act, 1952".

5 TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

6 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

7 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
8 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$115,000.

9 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

10 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of
11 Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services
12 and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements,
13 ~~\$390,000~~ \$374,537, of which not more than \$293,805 shall
14 be available for personal services.

15 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

16 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carry-
17 ing out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as
18 amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392, Public Law 459, approved
19 March 16, 1950); the Tea Importation Act, as amended
20 (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C.
21 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C.
22 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C.
23 61-64); including the purchase of not to exceed seven pas-
24 senger motor vehicles, of which two shall be for replace-

1 ment only; reporting and illustrating the results of
 2 investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scien-
 3 tific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment in advance
 4 for special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of
 5 fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new
 6 developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement opera-
 7 tions; ~~\$5,345,000~~ \$5,172,975, of which not more than
 8 \$4,218,475 shall be available for personal services.

9 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-
 10 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspec-
 11 tion of certain products in accordance with sections 406, 504,
 12 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug,
 13 and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 354, 356,
 14 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the advance
 15 deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payment of
 16 fees by applicants for certification or inspection of such prod-
 17 ucts, to remain available until expended. The total amount
 18 herein appropriated shall be available for personal services;
 19 purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment,
 20 and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has
 21 been rendered.

22 FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

23 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for
 24 operation and maintenance, including repairs; purchase of
 25 one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; furnishing,

1 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by
 2 employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer
 3 of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard
 4 University" for salaries of technical and professional person-
 5 nel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of
 6 Howard University for instruction of nurses and actual cost
 7 of heat, light, and power furnished by such university;
 8 ~~\$2,906,500~~ \$2,631,500, of which not more than \$2,053,786
 9 shall be available for personal services: Provided, That no
 10 intern or resident physician receiving compensation from
 11 this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compen-
 12 sation in the form of wages or salary from any other ap-
 13 propriation in this title.

14 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

15 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of How-
 16 ard University, including personal services and miscella-
 17 neous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds,
 18 ~~\$2,525,000~~ \$2,415,084.

19 Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans
 20 and specifications for construction, under the supervision of
 21 the General Services Administration, on the grounds of
 22 Howard University of a pharmacy building, including engi-
 23 neering and architectural services, advertising, and travel,
 24 \$55,500, to remain available until expended.

25 Construction of buildings: For construction of buildings

1 on the grounds of Howard University, under the supervision
 2 of the General Services Administration, to remain available
 3 until expended, as follows:

4 For construction of a pharmacy building, together with
 5 alterations and installations in connection with such con-
 6 struction, including engineering and architectural services,
 7 and travel, \$904,500;

8 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
 9 provided under this head in the First Deficiency Appropria-
 10 tion Act, 1948, as amended by the Second Deficiency Ap-
 11 propriation Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for construction
 12 of an engineering building, \$332,000.

13 OFFICE OF EDUCATION

14 Promotion and further development of vocational edu-
 15 cation: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the
 16 Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section
 17 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), and sec-
 18 tion 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30)
 19 and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462),
 20 ~~\$18,223,261~~ \$20,017,760: *Provided*, That the apporportion-
 21 ment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of
 22 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed
 23 ~~\$18,048,261~~ \$19,847,760 for the current fiscal year: ~~Pro-~~

1 *vided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be
2 available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

3 Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the
4 mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22
5 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 329), \$2,480,000.

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
7 Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations,
8 and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of
9 public and school library service; coordination of library
10 service on the national level with other forms of adult
11 education; developing library participation in Federal proj-
12 ects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials
13 among libraries, interstate library coordination and the devel-
14 opment of library service throughout the country; purchase,
15 distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-
16 picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and
17 cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles
18 of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative
19 of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education,
20 and repairing the same; ~~\$3,253,000~~ \$3,397,706, of which
21 not more than \$2,893,577 shall be available for personal
22 services, and of which not less than \$500,000 shall be
23 available for the Division of Vocational Education as author-

1 ized: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies
 2 representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of em-
 3 ployees of the Office of Education performing advisory
 4 functions to said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury
 5 of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

6 Payments to school districts: For payments to local
 7 educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
 8 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950
 9 (Public Law 874), ~~\$28,000,000~~ \$40,000,000: *Provided*,
 10 *That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying*
 11 *out the provisions of section 6 of such Act.*

12 Grants for school construction: For grants for emer-
 13 gency school construction to school districts in feder-
 14 ally affected areas as authorized by the Act of
 15 September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), to remain avail-
 16 able until expended, \$75,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 is
 17 for payment of obligations incurred under authority provided
 18 under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act,
 19 1951: *Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall
 20 be available for reimbursement payments under section 205
 21 (e) (1) of such Act with respect to school facilities com-
 22 pleted before July 1, 1951: *Provided further*, That in
 23 determining relative urgency of need for purposes of pre-
 24 scribing, under section 206 (d) of such Act, the order in
 25 which certifications for payments from this appropriation

1 shall be made (other than payments in liquidation of con-
 2 tractual obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1951), the
 3 Commissioner shall give special consideration to the extent
 4 to which the school facilities are needed in the interests of
 5 national defense.

6 SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

7 *For providing school facilities and for grants to local*
 8 *educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized*
 9 *by title II of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law*
 10 *815), to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000, of*
 11 *which \$25,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred*
 12 *under authority granted for the foregoing purpose in the*
 13 *Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.*

14 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

15 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
 16 Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,
 17 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Voca-
 18 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4),
 19 including payments, in accordance with regulations of the
 20 Administrator, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the
 21 acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accord-
 22 ance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of
 23 blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be con-
 24 trolled by the State agency, ~~\$20,475,000~~ \$21,500,000, of

1 *which not more than \$87,346 shall be available for personal*
2 *services, and of which not to exceed \$175,000 shall be avail-*
3 *able to the Federal Security Administrator for providing*
4 *rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of*
5 *Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which latter*
6 *amount shall be available for administrative expenses in*
7 *connection with providing such services in the District of*
8 *Columbia: Provided, That not to exceed 15 per centum of*
9 *the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes.*

10 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
11 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after
12 May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in
13 accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as
14 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding
15 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding
16 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations
17 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged
18 to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided,*
19 That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not
20 exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of
21 the current fiscal year.

22 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in car-
23 rying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation
24 Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936
25 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for

1 production, purchase, and distribution of educational films;
2 ~~\$705,000~~ \$675,620, of which not more than \$558,220 shall
3 be available for personal services.

4 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

5 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public
6 Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A)
7 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, includ-
8 ing (with the exception of the appropriation "Pay, and so
9 forth, commissioned officers, Public Health Service") pur-
10 chase of reports, documents, and other material for publica-
11 tion; preparation and display of posters and exhibits by con-
12 tract or otherwise; packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating,
13 drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commis-
14 sioned officers and transportation of their dependents on
15 change of station; and increased allowances to Reserve
16 officers for foreign service; as follows:

17 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
18 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
19 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
20 diagnosis, treatment, support, and clothing of persons afflicted
21 with venereal diseases; transportation and subsistence of such
22 persons and their attendants to and from the place of treat-
23 ment or allowance in lieu thereof; diagnosis and treatment
24 (including emergency treatment for other illnesses) of such
25 persons through contracts with physicians and hospitals and

1 other appropriate institutions; fees for case finding and
 2 referral to such centers of voluntary patients; reasonable
 3 expenses of preparing remains or burial of deceased patients;
 4 recreational supplies and equipment; leasing of facilities
 5 and repair and alteration of leased facilities; the purchase of
 6 not to exceed ~~fifteen~~ *twenty* passenger motor vehicles for re-
 7 placement only, and for grants of money, services, supplies,
 8 equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the
 9 Act, and with the approval of the respective State health
 10 authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political
 11 subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such
 12 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
 13 General may determine; ~~\$11,700,000~~ *\$11,653,360*, of which
 14 *not more than \$2,786,157 shall be available for personal*
 15 *services.*

16 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
 17 (b) of the Act, ~~\$8,745,000~~ *\$8,887,351*, of which *not more*
 18 *than \$2,140,323 shall be available for personal services.*

19 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes
 20 of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative serv-
 21 ices to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make
 22 field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section
 23 301 of the Act; and to provide for collecting and compiling
 24 mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics (including procure-
 25 ment by contract of transcripts of State, municipal, and other

1 records), including the purchase of not to exceed ten pas-
 2 senger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$15,960,000,
 3 *of which not more than \$1,900,944 shall be available for*
 4 *personal services.*

5 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-
 6 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, 361,
 7 and 704 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
 8 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate
 9 transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,
 10 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; the purchase
 11 of not to exceed ~~twenty~~ *thirty* passenger motor vehicles and
 12 two aircraft for replacement only; and hire, maintenance,
 13 and operation of aircraft; ~~\$6,090,000~~ *\$5,915,747*, *of which*
 14 *not more than \$4,450,816 shall be available for personal*
 15 *services.*

16 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For
 17 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out
 18 those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act
 19 relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental
 20 health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws
 21 and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out
 22 the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C.
 23 466-466 (j)), including purchase of not to exceed eleven
 24 passenger motor vehicles, of which nine shall be for replace-

ment only; ~~\$3,710,000~~ \$3,648,158, of which not more than \$2,885,004 shall be available for personal services.

Grants, water pollution control: For grants to carry out section 8 (a) of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)), \$900,000, to remain available until expended.

Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704 of the Act, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, and hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, ~~\$1,234,000~~ \$1,211,129, of which not more than \$434,547 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That property of the Public Health Service located in Alaska and used in carrying out the activities herein authorized may be transferred, without reimbursement, to the Territory of Alaska at the discretion of the Surgeon General.

Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio: For payment

1 of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under
 2 the head "Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio," Gen-
 3 eral Services Administration, in the Independent Offices
 4 Appropriation Act, 1951, \$2,400,000, to remain available
 5 until expended.

6 Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hos-
 7 pital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as
 8 amended, to remain available until expended, ~~\$175,000,000~~
 9 ~~\$195,000,000~~, of which \$100,000,000 is for payment of
 10 obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under
 11 this head: *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to
 12 the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on
 13 the basis of an amount equal to that part of the appropriation
 14 granted herein which is available for new obligations.

15 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
 16 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
 17 of the Act, as amended, including the purchase of not to
 18 exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only
 19 ~~\$1,195,000~~ \$1,166,465, of which not more than \$1,017,165
 20 shall be available for personal services.

21 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-
 22 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8,
 23 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324,
 24 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the
 25 Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of

1 February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm
2 products and livestock; purchase of not to exceed fifteen pas-
3 senger motor vehicles, including four ambulances, for replace-
4 ment only; and firearms and ammunitions; \$30,200,000:
5 *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service establishes
6 or operates a health service program for any department or
7 agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in
8 advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

9 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
10 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing
11 the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign coun-
12 tries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with
13 section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of
14 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
15 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the
16 Public Health Service are not available, including insurance
17 of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required
18 by law of such countries; and the purchase of not to exceed
19 twelve passenger motor vehicles of which ten shall be for
20 replacement only; ~~\$2,990,000~~ \$2,868,029, *of which not*
21 *more than \$2,507,458 shall be available for personal services.*

22 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For
23 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-
24 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants
25 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; the

1 regulation and preparation of biologic products; the purchase
2 of not to exceed six passenger motor vehicles for replace-
3 ment only; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visit-
4 ing scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon
5 General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of
6 adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH), cortisone, and other
7 chemical substances, and for development of other related
8 compounds; ~~\$15,500,000~~ *\$15,559,973, of which not more*
9 *than \$4,560,505 shall be available for personal services.*

10 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon
11 General, upon the recommendations of the National Ad-
12 visory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research
13 and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with
14 State health agencies, and other public and private non-
15 profit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradica-
16 tion of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstra-
17 tions, and grants-in-aid; for the purchase of not to exceed
18 ~~four~~ *six* passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and
19 to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of
20 the Act; ~~\$19,500,000~~ *\$19,805,171, of which not more than*
21 *\$2,694,760 shall be available for personal services, of which*
22 *not less than \$4,625,000 shall be available exclusively for*
23 *payment of obligations for research and training grants in-*
24 *curred under authority heretofore granted under this head.*

25 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for

1 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,
2 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,
3 ~~\$10,300,000~~ \$10,737,974, of which not more than \$1,178,-
4 489 shall be available for personal services, of which not
5 less than \$573,000 shall be available exclusively for payment
6 of obligations for research and training grants incurred under
7 authority heretofore granted under this head.

8 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
9 carry on the purposes of the National Heart Act, including
10 the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles
11 for replacement only, ~~\$10,000,000~~ \$10,072,982, of which
12 not more than \$1,463,333 shall be available for personal
13 services.

14 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
15 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to
16 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
17 diseases and conditions, ~~\$1,500,000~~ \$1,697,308, of which
18 not more than \$1,001,156 shall be available for personal
19 services.

20 Construction of research facilities: For construction of
21 research facilities, to be transferred (except such part as may
22 be necessary for incidental expenses and purchase of equip-
23 ment by the Public Health Service) to the General Services
24 Administration, and to remain available until expended, as
25 follows:

1 For continuation of construction of a combined hospital
2 and research building as authorized under this head in the
3 Federal Security Agency Appropriation Acts of 1949 and
4 1950, ~~\$10,400,000~~, ~~\$9,445,000~~, *together with \$955,000 to be*
5 *derived by transfer from funds provided for the construction*
6 *of additional auxiliary structures under this head in the*
7 *Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1951, of which*
8 *\$10,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under*
9 *authority heretofore granted under this head.*

10 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
11 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of
12 auxiliary service area structures, as authorized under this
13 head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
14 1950, \$300,000.

15 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
16 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of
17 additional auxiliary structures as authorized under this
18 head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
19 1951, ~~\$350,000~~ *\$250,000.*

20 For purchase and installation of additional equipment,
21 supplies, and furnishings for structures heretofore provided
22 under this head, ~~\$6,640,000~~ *\$6,635,540, of which not more*
23 *than \$84,740 shall be available for personal services.*

24 Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth: For pay, uni-
25 forms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for

1 foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed
2 one thousand five hundred regular active commissioned
3 officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular
4 and reserve commissioned officers; for payment of claims for
5 private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or
6 damaged in the military service of the United States, as
7 authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 222c, h; 42 U. S. C. 213) ;
8 and for six months' death gratuity pay and burial payments
9 for regular commissioned officers; ~~\$1,790,000~~ \$1,861,-
10 500, of which not more than \$731,500 shall be available
11 for personal services, and the Surgeon General is author-
12 ized to advance to this appropriation from appropriations
13 made available to the Public Health Service for the current
14 fiscal year such additional amounts as may be necessary for
15 pay and allowances of the officers herein authorized.

16 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the
17 Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses
18 of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere,
19 including conducting research on technical nursing standards
20 and furnishing consultative nursing services; preparing in-
21 formation, articles, and publications related to public health;
22 conducting studies and demonstrations in public health
23 methods; carrying on international health activities, including
24 not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other
25 countries when specifically authorized by the Surgeon Gen-

1 eral; and purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor
 2 vehicles for replacement only; ~~\$2,850,000~~ \$2,745,868, of
 3 *which not more than \$2,320,514 shall be available for per-*
 4 *sonal services.*

5 SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

6 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 7 maintenance and operation of the hospital, including purchase
 8 of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for re-
 9 placement only, clothing for patients and cooperation with
 10 organizations or individuals in scientific research into the
 11 nature, causes, prevention, and treatment of mental illness,
 12 \$2,135,000.

13 Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds:
 14 For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and
 15 equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including prepa-
 16 ration of plans and specifications, advertising, and super-
 17 vision of construction, \$136,500, to remain available until
 18 expended: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may
 19 be transferred to the General Services Administration.

20 SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

21 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions:
 22 For expenses necessary for the supervision of Federal credit
 23 unions, ~~\$175,000~~ \$167,650, together with the aggregate of
 24 amounts received from certificate, supervision, and examina-
 25 tion fees collected from Federal credit unions as authorized

1 by law, of which total sum not more than \$614,650 shall be
2 available for personal services.

3 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Sur-
4 vivors Insurance: For necessary expenses, including pur-
5 chase of four passenger motor vehicles; and furnishing,
6 repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment
7 used by building guards; not more than ~~\$58,000,000~~ \$57,-
8 437,980 may be expended from the Federal old-age and sur-
9 vivors insurance trust fund, of which not more than \$48,697,-
10 378 shall be available for personal services.

11 Reimbursement to Federal old-age and survivors in-
12 surance trust fund: For reimbursement to the Federal old-
13 age and survivors insurance trust fund for administrative
14 costs and for benefits paid during the period July 1, 1949
15 through August 31, 1950 to the survivors of veterans of
16 World War II eligible for benefits as provided under section
17 210 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C.
18 410), \$3,734,000.

19 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
20 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children,
21 aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally
22 disabled, as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the
23 Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7,
24 subch. I, IV, and X, 64 Stat. 477), ~~\$1,250,000,000~~
25 \$1,150,000,000, of which such amount as may be necessary

1 shall be available for grants for any period in the prior fiscal
 2 year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

3 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance:
 4 For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,
 5 ~~\$1,463,400~~ \$1,600,000, of which not more than \$1,455,400
 6 shall be available for personal services.

7 Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary
 8 expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as
 9 amended (29 U. S. C. 18a), and title V of the Social Security
 10 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including
 11 purchase of reports and material for the publications of the
 12 Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution, ~~\$1,450,-~~
 13 ~~000~~ \$1,500,000, of which not more than \$1,238,900 shall be
 14 available for personal services: *Provided*, That no part of any
 15 appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promul-
 16 gate or carry out any instructions, order, or regulation relat-
 17 ing to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between
 18 persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Pro-*
 19 *vided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so
 20 construed as to prevent any patient from having the services
 21 of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this
 22 fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided*
 23 *further*, That any State plan which provides standards for
 24 professional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws
 25 of the State shall be approved.

1 Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For
 2 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-
 3 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as au-
 4 thorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
 5 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
 6 ~~\$30,000,000~~ \$33,000,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to
 7 a State pursuant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act
 8 shall not be included in computing for the purposes of subsec-
 9 tions (a) and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an
 10 amount expended or estimated to be expended by the State:
 11 *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be allotted on
 12 a pro rata basis among the several States in proportion to the
 13 amounts to which the respective States are entitled for the
 14 current fiscal year by reason of section 331 of the Social
 15 Security Act Amendments of 1950.

16 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
 17 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for
 18 Social Security, ~~\$219,700~~ \$200,000, together with not to
 19 exceed ~~\$110,300~~ \$100,000 to be transferred from the Fed-
 20 eral old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

21 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
 22 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments
 23 to States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respec-
 24 tively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first
 25 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may

1 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures
 2 made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to
 3 be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

4 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
 5 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
 6 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter
 7 in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
 8 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to
 9 a State plan approved under such title prior to or during
 10 such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect
 11 to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which
 12 such plan was submitted for approval.

13 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

14 Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office of
 15 the Administrator, ~~\$2,050,000~~ \$2,150,000, together with not
 16 to exceed ~~\$403,000~~ \$413,000 to be transferred from the
 17 Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*,
 18 That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation
 19 from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Fed-
 20 eral Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to
 21 finance the regional office activities of such constituent
 22 organizations.

23 Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:
 24 For expenses necessary for the Office of the Administrator,
 25 including salaries for the Division of Service Operations; and

1 purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement
 2 only; \$711,500, together with not to exceed \$123,500 to
 3 be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors in-
 4 surance trust fund, *of which total sum not more than \$402,045*
 5 *shall be available for personal services: Provided, That the*
 6 Administrator may advance to this appropriation from ap-
 7 propriations of constituent organizations of the Federal
 8 Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to cover
 9 the charges for services, supplies, equipment, and materials
 10 furnished.

11 Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Salaries, Office of
 12 the General Counsel, ~~\$412,000~~ \$396,478, together with not
 13 to exceed \$22,950 to be transferred from the appropriation
 14 "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-
 15 ices", and not to exceed \$389,000 to be transferred from
 16 the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

17 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for
 18 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)
 19 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of
 20 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal
 21 excess property for educational purposes and protection of
 22 public health, ~~\$100,000~~ \$75,000.

23 GENERAL PROVISIONS

24 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
 25 salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of

1 estimates of appropriations in the field, and for payment
2 in advance when authorized by the Federal Security Ad-
3 ministrator for dues or fees for library membership in
4 organizations whose publications are available to members
5 only or to members at a price lower than to the general
6 public.

7 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
8 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
9 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
10 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

11 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available
12 for salaries and expenses shall be available for travel ex-
13 penses and for expenses of attendance at meetings con-
14 cerned with the function or activity for which any such ap-
15 propriation is made.

16 SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this
17 title to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid
18 of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
19 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses
20 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld
21 from the said agencies of any States which have established
22 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit sys-
23 tem and classification and compensation plan covering the
24 selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their em-
25 ployees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the

1 manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States,
 2 or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

3 This title may be cited as the "Federal Security
 4 Agency Appropriation Act, 1952".

5 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS

6 BOARD

7 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 8 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
 9 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
 10 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including
 11 expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work
 12 of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman
 13 or the General Counsel; and services as authorized by section
 14 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
 15 ~~\$8,000,000~~ \$8,233,959, of which not more than \$6,622,284
 16 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That no
 17 part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or
 18 assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connec-
 19 tion with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders con-
 20 cerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as
 21 referred to in section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49
 22 Stat. 450), and as amended by the Labor-Management Rela-
 23 tions Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of
 24 June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060).

1 This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations
2 Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

3 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

4 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
5 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
6 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
7 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~\$400,000~~ \$394,247, *of which not*
8 *more than \$299,307 shall be available for personal services.*

9 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses nec-
10 essary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of
11 the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157),
12 and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant
13 to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including
14 stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~\$150,000~~
16 *\$144,000, of which not more than \$114,000 shall be available*
17 *for personal services.*

18 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

19 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
20 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
21 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
22 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$600,000, *of which not*
23 *more than \$460,774 shall be available for personal services*
24 *and of which not less than \$250,000 shall be available for*

1 compensation (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and
 2 expenses of referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the
 3 Railway Labor Act, as amended.

4 This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board
 5 Appropriation Act, 1952".

6 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

7 Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual
 8 premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions,
 9 and death benefits, in accordance with the provisions of the
 10 Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended
 11 (~~45 U. S. C. 228-228s~~), and for expenses necessary for the
 12 Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said Acts
 13 as specifically provided for under this title, for crediting to
 14 the railroad retirement account, an amount equal to amounts
 15 covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during the cur-
 16 rent fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act
 17 (~~28 U. S. C. 1500-1538~~).

18 *Railroad retirement account: For an amount sufficient*
 19 *as an annual premium for the payments required under the*
 20 *Railroad Retirement Acts of August 29, 1935, and June 24,*
 21 *1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the railroad*
 22 *retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the*
 23 *latter Act, \$562,534,409: Provided, That such total amount*
 24 *shall be available until expended for making payments re-*
 25 *quired under said retirement acts, and the amount not*

1 *required for current payments shall be invested by the Sec-*
 2 *retary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions*
 3 *of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937.*

4 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
 5 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
 6 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of at-
 7 tendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board
 8 when specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic
 9 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
 10 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; ~~\$5,268,000~~ \$5,056,-
 11 904, to be derived from the railroad retirement account, of
 12 which not more than \$4,010,820 shall be available for per-
 13 sonal services.

14 This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement
 15 Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

16 TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND 17 CONCILIATION SERVICE

18 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 19 Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-
 20 Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171–180,
 21 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel
 22 as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employ-
 23 ment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor
 24 relations at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem; expenses of
 25 attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial

1 relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the
 2 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; ~~\$2,949,000~~
 3 *\$3,047,000, of which not more than \$2,566,653 shall be*
 4 *available for personal services.*

5 Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay neces-
 6 sary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the Presi-
 7 dent pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management
 8 Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176-180, 182), includ-
 9 ing services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
 10 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of
 11 Columbia, ~~\$50,000~~ *\$48,750, of which not more than \$23,750*
 12 *shall be available for personal services.*

13 This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and
 14 Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1952".

15 TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

16 SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in
 17 this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any
 18 person who engages in a strike against the Government of
 19 the United States or who is a member of an organization
 20 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
 21 against the Government of the United States, or who ad-
 22 vocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates,
 23 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
 24 force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an
 25 affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the

1 person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions
2 of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of
3 the United States, is not a member of an organization of
4 Government employees that asserts the right to strike against
5 the Government of the United States, or that such person
6 does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization
7 that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the
8 United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That
9 any person who engages in a strike against the Government
10 of the United States or who is a member of an organization
11 of Government employees that asserts the right to strike
12 against the Government of the United States, or who advo-
13 cates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates,
14 the overthrow of the Government of the United States by
15 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
16 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained
17 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,
18 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not
19 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the
20 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
21 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

22 SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in
23 this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes
24 not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

25 ~~SEC. 703.~~ No part of any appropriations or authoriza-

1 tions contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensa-
 2 tion of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position
 3 which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning
 4 on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not
 5 apply—

6 (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all such
 7 vacancies.

8 (b) to positions filled from within the agency.

9 (c) to offices or positions required by law to be
 10 filled by appointment^e of the President by and with the
 11 advice and consent of the Senate.

12 (d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel,
 13 including orderlies, in the Public Health Service; St.
 14 Elizabeths Hospital and Freedmen's Hospital.

15 (e) to employees in grades C. P. C. 1 and 2.

16 SEC. 704 703. This Act may be cited as the "Labor-
 17 Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives April 18, 1951.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

82^d CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3709

[Report No. 386]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

APRIL 19 (legislative day, APRIL 17), 1951

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

JUNE 6, 1951

Reported with amendments

rol but the vigorous use of the priority power to insure that first things come first through the entire economy; much heavier taxation; an end to all unnecessary spending; screen all proposed issues of new securities to put off what can be postponed. Let us make sure that all grants and loans to other countries are weighed in terms of the material resources involved and not simply release more money which encourages other nations to drive up prices in competition for limited quantities of raw materials.

4. There is no avoiding the issue. Until the gap between Soviet armament and our defenses is bridged there can be no basis for peace. The longer our mobilization drags, the greater the ultimate effort and cost which will have to be borne.

We should be able to relax controls once we have balanced Russia's rearmament.

Neglect and procrastination have aggravated the problem. When the Korean fighting began, prompt action should have been taken to bring the economy under control and to avert the profiteering and speculation which were bound to come. The experience of the last two wars showed this was what had to be done, and, as you know, I urged it upon your committee. Instead, the economy was allowed to run wild. Ever since, there has been a frantic scramble to recover the equilibrium that should never have been lost.

Those who seek exemption for their own profits do not serve their own true interests. What will it gain the farmer or worker or businessman to get a little more for his production, if that is offset by rising prices and by the cheapening of all savings in every form—life insurance, Government bonds, thrift accounts, annuities, pensions.

Those savings represent past earnings with which millions of people expect to finance their retirement as they grow old, to help put their children through school, to care for their loved ones after they are gone, to buy a home. Slash the purchasing power of those savings through inflation and millions will be robbed of their means of independence. They will be forced to turn to the state.

It is because I am so opposed to Government controls in peacetime that I feel so strongly the need for the controls now. To fail to stop inflation is to invite perpetual regimentation in the future.

Already no city or State can plan even for the immediate years ahead. How much will the taxes collected be worth and by how much more will expenses have risen? Already our educational institutions are struggling to survive in the face of shrinking endowment funds. Hospitals and charitable institutions will have to close or curtail their services; every form of voluntary insurance against sickness and accident will have to be refinanced and higher rates charged.

Millions of persons on fixed incomes—policemen, firemen, teachers, nurses, civil servants, and others—are being ground between rising prices and rising taxes. What is to be their future if prices are allowed to run wild?

I could go on for pages showing how inflation strikes at everything Americans hold dear, at all our social and personal values, at all our families and institutions. Nor is it surprising that it should be so. For the test of our ability to stop inflation is the test of our ability to govern ourselves. It is the test of what we prize most highly—petty profits and trivial comforts, or freedom.

It is the test of whether we are a Nation united in awareness of common interests or whether we are a mere aggregation of pres-

sure groups divided in a scramble for selfish gain.

It is the test of our fitness to survive.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD M. BARUCH.

P. S.—You know well enough what to do, damn the political torpedoes, go ahead.

B.

AFFIRMATION OF FRIENDSHIP OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE FOR ALL THE PEOPLES OF THE WORLD

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union, which were to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

That the Congress of the United States reaffirms the historic and abiding friendship of the American people for all other peoples, and declares—

That the American people deeply regret the artificial barriers which separate them from the peoples of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and which keep the Soviet peoples from learning of the desire of the American people to live in friendship with all other peoples, and to work with them in advancing the ideal of human brotherhood; and

That the American people believe the Soviet Government could advance the cause of peace immeasurably by removing those artificial barriers, thus permitting the free exchange of information between our peoples; and

That the American people and their Government desire neither war with the Soviet Union nor the terrible consequences of such a war; and

That, although they are firmly determined to defend their freedom and security, the American people welcome all honorable efforts to resolve the differences standing between the United States Government and the Soviet Government and invite the peoples of the Soviet Union to cooperate in a spirit of friendship in this endeavor; and

That the Congress request the President of the United States to call upon the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to acquaint the peoples of the Soviet Union with the contents of this resolution.

And to amend the preamble by inserting after the third paragraph thereof a new paragraph to read as follows:

Whereas the Congress reaffirms its policy as expressed in law "to continue to exert maximum efforts to obtain agreements to provide the United Nations with armed forces as contemplated in the Charter and agreements to achieve universal control of weapons of mass destruction and universal regulation and reduction of armaments, including armed forces, under adequate safeguards to protect complying nations against violation and evasion"; and.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. McMAHON, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3709.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is the so-called Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill. I am in total sympathy with the plan to take up the appropriation bill. I am in total sympathy with the idea of proceeding right along with the Senate program, as the majority leader well knows. However, I wish to point out to him, and also to the Senator in charge of the bill, the very gracious Senator and respected Senator from the great State of New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I like the Senator from Nebraska, too.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

It has come to my attention that certain Senators are very anxious to obtain statistics and facts from various agencies relative to the application of the so-called Jensen amendment, which the House adopted, and which will be in conference, as well as the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], which approaches the question of stabilization of employment in another fashion, namely, by a 5-percent cut in appropriations for salaries.

I am wondering if the distinguished majority leader would not heed the pleas of Senators who have talked with me this morning. Perhaps we could proceed with this bill, or with some other bill, until Senators have an opportunity to obtain the statistics and facts which they desire. If that is not feasible, would the Senator include in his motion a stipulation—if that is agreeable to the Senator in charge of the bill—that Senators be given time to prepare themselves to discuss the controversial amendments, so that they may be threshed out on the floor of the Senate?

The Independent Offices appropriation bill is being marked up this afternoon by the full Committee on Appropriations. I understand that the Jensen amendment is also included in that bill, although I am not a member of the subcommittee having it in charge. It seems to me that in all the appropriation bills in which the Jensen amendment is involved, the application should be the same, so far as possible, as in connection with the Labor-Federal Security bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It will possibly be the general pattern.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I wish to cooperate fully with the distinguished majority leader in expediting the work of the Senate. With that in mind, I wonder if the Senator in charge of the bill can give assurance that Senators who are interested in controversial amendments will have an opportunity to present their views. In the meantime, we might proceed with the bill and agree to the amendments which are not controversial. If it is desired to pass over an amendment temporarily, it could be held up until later this afternoon, or preferably until tomorrow, if that is agreeable. That would give Senators an opportunity this afternoon and tonight to prepare themselves to discuss both the Jensen amendment and the so-called Cordon amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am in complete sympathy with the remarks of the Senator from Nebraska. I wish to cooperate with Senators, so that every Member of the Senate may understand the provisions of the bill.

In my opinion, the only controversial matter which will arise in connection with this bill will be the so-called Jensen amendment, or the substitute for it proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. Aside from that, with respect to the so-called money items, after I make the explanation as to those items I do not believe there will be any controversy.

Inasmuch as I wish to cooperate with the Senator from Nebraska, and inasmuch as I feel that the Senate would like to proceed with its work, I should like to have the Senate at least act on the money items and get them out of the way. We are now about 6 weeks behind with appropriation bills.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] have contacted my office and have asked for a little more time. I informed them, after talking with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, that he would be willing to take up the bill and dispose of the noncontroversial matters, and that he would be willing to pass over until tomorrow any items which they wanted to have passed over.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I have been assigned to the subcommittee headed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, which has had this bill under consideration. However, I did not have an opportunity to sit in any of the hearings. Before the bill was reported, I asked whether any Senator interested in economy had offered any suggestions to the subcommittee or the full committee as to how greater economy could be effected than the economy for which the subcommittee had voted. I was informed that no such suggestion had been offered. I therefore assumed that no Member of the Senate was planning to raise any serious objection.

Mr. WHERRY and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Arizona yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall not speak to the question raised by the Senator from Virginia. However, I believe that several amendments were offered to effect economies, and there was considerable debate as to the best way to do it—either through the Jensen amendment or the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. President, I should like to make a parliamentary inquiry. In the event we should have an understanding, and certain amendments were agreed to—I wish the Senator from Illinois would listen to this. It may involve what he is interested in.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I always listen to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. Now I will proceed.

Let us assume that all noncontroversial amendments in the bill are agreed to. Then we will come to the final amendment proposing to reduce the appropriation, or possibly the Senator from Illinois will offer such amendments as we proceed with the bill. If we wait until near the conclusion of the consideration of the bill before taking up the proposal for a reduction, it should be thoroughly understood that, although we may approve certain amendments as we go along, when the final amendment, providing for a reduction, is acted on it should apply to the amendments already adopted. If there is to be a blanket cut, it cannot be handled otherwise.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the Senator from Nebraska referring now to the blanket cut of 5 percent proposed by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So far as salaries are concerned, the 5-percent cut would apply to each individual item in the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point I make. Inasmuch as that is true, I want it thoroughly understood that if we should proceed with the consideration of the bill under the theory that noncontroversial amendments would be agreed to, even though an amendment might not be controversial at the moment, at the conclusion, so far as concerns a blanket amendment, such an amendment, even though it affected all the amendments previously agreed to, would not be foreclosed merely because we had previously adopted certain other amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct. Any amendments which we might possibly agree to at this time would not foreclose the 5-percent amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for making that clear.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Mexico for his graciousness in this matter. I appreciate the pressure under which the committee has been operating, the work which it has done, and the many perplexing problems which it has faced.

However, I should like to indicate the position in which other Members of the Senate are placed by the late reporting of this measure and its almost immediate consideration after the bill has been reported. It was not until 10 o'clock this morning that I was able to obtain a copy of the bill. It was not until 11:15 that I was able to obtain a copy of the report. I believe this is the first time that the hearings have been before the Senate in printed form.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the hearings have been available for some time. However, inasmuch as the bill was delayed for one whole week, until yesterday, because of the so-called Jensen amendment, it was impossible to prepare the final report and to report the bill until today. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that it is not giving Members of the Senate a great deal of time in which to study the measure. It is a measure which calls for appropriations of approximately two and a half billion dollars, even though the major portion of that amount is allocated to the States, and is more or less obligatory.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the last hour I have been preparing a series of amendments which I intend to offer to the bill. It has been work done under some pressure. I should like to suggest that we go through the bill, with the understanding that approval of committee amendments will not be final, but that if objections are subsequently raised to committee amendments that they may be reconsidered. I make the request because under the ordinary parliamentary procedure once a committee amendment is approved there is no possibility of subsequent reconsideration. Therefore, I would not like to have it understood that committee amendments would be approved in advance without possibility of reconsideration.

Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. ROBERTSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like first to answer the Senator from Illinois. I believe there is some reason and justification for the request of the Senator from Illinois. However, I believe he should allow me to proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to proceed to make explanation of the committee's position and decision on the subject matter. If, following such explanation, he wishes to make his request I shall be very glad to consider it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I merely wish to point out to the Senator from Illinois that I, too, am very much interested in economy. I am as much interested in economy as he is. I wish to say also that he has known for more than a month what is contained in the House bill. If he felt the House bill contained appropriations which he considered were too high, he had sufficient time in which to

make suggestions in that regard to the subcommittee.

The subcommittee has cut the House appropriations by more than \$100,000,000. Many of the cuts affect hospital work and activities which are of very tender concern to a good many Members of the Senate. The subcommittee felt that, outside of the salaries, it had cut all that it could afford to cut. Otherwise, I would have voted for more cuts.

In this morning's Washington Post I read an article by a prominent commentator in which he intimated that the Democrats had not done so well by taking the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] off the Appropriations Committee and putting me on the committee in his place, because I gave my proxy to a Republican member, who voted for economy, which is what a Republican member of the committee would have done. Mr. President, each year we celebrate Jefferson-Jackson Day. If anyone knows anything about Jefferson and Jackson he must know that economy was one of the fundamental principles for which they stood. I do not object to being called a Republican, if being for economy puts me in that category.

I should like to ask what we would accomplish if we considered a committee amendment and acted on it with the understanding that we were only going through the motion of adopting it and could go back and take it up again at a later date. I think that we should conclude our consideration of the amendments in which we have already cut \$100,000,000, but that we should leave for final vote until tomorrow the question of whether or not we shall adopt the Cordon amendment, calling for a 5-percent cut of all salaries, which would amount to a saving of something over \$2,000,000, or whether we should adopt the Ferguson proposal, making a cut of 10 percent.

Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FERGUSON, and Mr. WHERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator will not press for a final vote on the bill today and will not proceed in any manner which would cut off consideration of amendments to the bill. The Senator from Michigan feels that the amount of the appropriations in the bill is too high.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Michigan has been telling us that for the last 2 months.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and I must insist on it on the floor. I believe that the cost of Government is too high. We must cut it. We tried to do so in committee. In the opinion of the senior Senator from Michigan, we have not been very successful. I hope we will be given an opportunity to be more successful on the floor.

The work of the Committee on Appropriations is very exacting. It is hard work. It takes all of the time of the Senators who sit on the committee. The Senator from Michigan was unable to do anything on the bill this morning be-

cause he appeared before the Committee on Appropriations, sitting in the Caucus Room, and listened to military authorities explain that their appropriations will run to about \$60,000,000,000. They also indicated that there would be requests for supplemental and deficiency appropriations over and above that amount. Therefore, today, we are facing one of the greatest tasks of government, which is deciding on the amount of money that should be appropriated. There is no doubt whatever that the cost of government has increased over and above the aggregate of the Government's income. It therefore behooves every Member of the Senate to do everything he can to see to it that we make proper appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course neither the Senator from New Mexico nor any other Senator can prohibit or prevent the Senator from Michigan from offering amendments to the recommendations which have been made by the Committee on Appropriations. It is not the purpose of the Senator from New Mexico, who is handling the bill on the floor, to prevent any Senator from offering any amendment he may desire to offer.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we go through the items in the bill and agree to them in the absence of amendments which some Senators desire to offer to such items, we shall be prevented later from offering such amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is all very well to talk about economy. However, we must be reasonable about this so-called economy. If we really mean what we say we can carry it to extremes. In this body there is a great deal of loose talk and discussion of subjects which do not involve either the Government or economy, and there is more money being wasted on such discussions than could be saved by amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish Senators would take it seriously and not waste so much of the taxpayers' money in a discussion of matters that do not effect any savings whatever. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I resent the Senator's indicating that discussions on the floor of the Senate involve the expenditure of more money than could be saved on an appropriation bill involving more than \$2,000,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly so, but if the Senator from Michigan had met with the committee, and possibly if he had not been more interested in finding out what was going as between Truman and MacArthur, he would understand the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan understands the bill, and he believes it should be cut.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly he does, but it happens that the majority of the members of the committee, with the exception of the Senator from Michigan, thought otherwise.

Mr. FERGUSON. As the Senator knows, I voted proxies on the cuts.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Montana gave proxies to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Nebraska, the Senator from New Hampshire, and the Senator from Montana did not attend one hearing of the subcommittee.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say that it is true that I have not attended all the meetings of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee. I am on six or seven of those subcommittees, just as the Senator from New Mexico is. I gave my proxy to the Senator from Michigan because at the time when this subcommittee was holding hearings, two other subcommittees were holding hearings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to read the list of the subcommittees on which I serve.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me say that I am not even on the subcommittee which considered this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Mexico has been a Member of the Senate for a long time, and he knows that it is a physical impossibility for Senators who serve on a number of subcommittees to attend all the meetings of all of them. In my case, it is a physical impossibility for me to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the Senator could have consulted the Senator from California, who has been the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and he could have consulted the Senator from Minnesota, who is just as much an economizer and is just as sincere as the rest of us are, and then the Senator would have found that the entire minority side of the subcommittee voted unanimously to report the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

I repeat that I am on a number of subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, namely, the subcommittees on Agriculture, Armed Services, District of Columbia, Interior, Independent Offices, State, Justice and Commerce, and Judiciary.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the Senator that it is impossible for each Senator to attend all the meetings of all the subcommittees. For that reason I gave my proxy to the distinguished Senator from Michigan. Although I did not attend all the meetings of the full committee, I attended several of them; and I believe I understand what is involved in the Jensen amendment and

the so-called Cordon amendment, which is the crux of the whole matter.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No one to trying to rush proceedings on the Jensen amendment. The full committee decided that the cut should be 5 percent. However, if the Senate wishes to make a 7½ percent or a 10-percent or a 15-percent cut, that will be all right with me.

It is not my purpose to prevent any Senator from speaking, but I wish to have the Senate proceed in an orderly manner, and see whether we can complete action on at least a few of the items contained in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Mexico appreciates that I am not a member of the subcommittee. However, as a member of the full committee, I attended every session when the full committee was engaged in marking up the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from New Mexico has agreed that although he will proceed with the committee amendments, action upon them now will not be final, and that it will be in order for amendments to be submitted to them later, in proposing alterations in the committee amendments? Do I correctly understand that is the present situation?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair does not think that is a parliamentary inquiry, but is an inquiry addressed to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me suggest that we have never had any trouble in giving time to Senators who really need time in connection with appropriation bills. This bill is not as yet before the Senate for consideration. I am sure that if we make it the unfinished business and allow the distinguished Senator from New Mexico to explain the bill, then we come to the particular amendments in which Senators are interested, we shall be able to work them out; I do not think there will be any difficulty.

Mr. CHAVEZ. How could any Senator prevent another Senator from offering an amendment if he desired to do so?

Mr. DOUGLAS. However, once the committee amendments are agreed to, they are no longer subject to amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. After the bill is made the unfinished business, when we come to pass on the individual items or amendments, if a Senator then wishes to make a reservation of the right to offer an amendment to one of those amendments, I am sure we shall not have any trouble in making such an arrangement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that my wife is leaving for Europe in about an hour, and I should like to have the privilege of seeing her off, but without closing the way to having an opportunity to present objections which I may have to individual committee amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, being a married man, too, I appreciate the position of the Senator from Illinois, and I shall carry on until he returns.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I wish to understand the mechanics of the procedure in connection with the bill. I understand that the Senator from New Mexico is willing to have any amendment calling for a blanket cut passed over temporarily, so that we may take action on amendments which are not controversial.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the Senator discussing the Cordon amendment?

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; but, of course, there is no such thing as a Cordon amendment which is to be offered to only one committee amendment. The Cordon amendment would apply to each salary item in the bill. For example, on page 2 of the bill, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary," there is an item, in line 13, of \$1,425,000 which was agreed to by the House; but the committee has reported an amendment to that item, reducing it by 5 percent, so that the amount would be \$1,400,000.

Mr. President, if we are in favor of the substance of the Cordon amendment and wish to support it, at least before acting on it we can talk over the various items; and at the end of that procedure, when the Jensen amendment comes up, we can go back and make a blanket cut or we can make a cut in any individual item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] offered his particular amendment and wished to make it applicable to all the salary items. There are approximately 70 such items in the bill. The committee decided that the 5-percent reduction should apply to each individual salary item, instead of being a 5-percent reduction in the total amount carried in the bill. The committee staff had quite a time figuring out what that cut would amount to in dollars and cents in the case of the 70 different items. In each case it was necessary to determine the dollars-and-cents reduction which would be made by a 5-percent cut in the items for salaries. We did not believe we should apply that cut to other items, such as expenses, which are different from salaries. The Senator from Oregon had in mind applying the cut only to salaries.

So in connection with this particular bill, we have worked in that way on 70 different items; and as we have reported the bill, it contains committee amendments which set forth the amounts of money which will be saved by applying the 5-percent reduction to the salary items.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from New Mexico agree that tomorrow any Senator can offer a motion to reduce the amount of any item contained in the bill, whether it be a salary item or any other item? If the Senator will agree to that, I think we can proceed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there would be no use in taking the time of the Senate today, if we were to agree to a proposition of that kind. If the Senator from Michigan wants to make a reduction of 10 percent, 15 percent, or 90 percent—as he probably would desire—the Senator from New Mexico has no objection. All the Senator from New Mexico is asking is that, after 3 months of trial, tribulations, and hard work during which a nonpartisan committee has considered this bill, its consideration be proceeded with. The report of the subcommittee was entirely unanimous, and the Senate knows that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the ranking member on the minority side, has contributed to the effort to save money on this particular bill. If the Senate will allow me to explain exactly what has been done, not only by the subcommittee but by the full committee, it will realize that, if there is any committee which has tried to effect savings of the taxpayers' money, it is this committee. But Senators do not give us an opportunity.

If the Senator from Michigan wants to cut the appropriations contained in the bill 10 percent, why not let the Senate vote on the question and be through with it?

All I ask is that we do not waste the money of the taxpayers in futile discussion but proceed to use the time of the Senate for the remainder of the day, one way or the other. If the Senate is not satisfied with this bill, it can amend it. All I am reporting now is the action of the subcommittee, after months of hearings. All I am reporting now is the action of the full committee, after 2 weeks' consideration. All I am reporting, even on the so-called Cordon amendment, or the Jensen amendment, is the action of the full committee, after a whole week of delay in discussing that subject matter. This is the committee's action.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator think it is unreasonable for other Members of the Senate who are not on the subcommittee and who are not on the Appropriations Committee, to raise this question, in the face of a report which is not even on the desks of Senators, other than that, probably, of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; I certainly have one.

Mr. FERGUSON. No other Senator has one, I think. Should not a bill involving more than \$2,000,000,000, the hearings on which number 1,232 pages lie on the desk of the Senate for longer than 1 day?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am trying to promote consistency, as urged by my good friend

from Michigan, in effecting savings for the taxpayers. The Appropriations Committee spent days and days, even months, in an effort to carry out the instructions of the Senate. We were not acting in our individual capacities; we were there acting as agents of the full committee, the members of which, in turn, were the agents of the Senate of the United States.

If we are to carry out the idea of saving money, we should be permitted to proceed, and to ascertain what the Senate thinks regarding the items of the bill. If the Senate does not like the report of the committee, and if the Senate does not like the bill, the Senate has the power and authority to amend it by way of reductions or otherwise.

Let us go a little further in the matter of saving money. Usually by this time in June the Senate has four or five or perhaps six appropriation bills out of the way. This is the first one of the 1952 appropriation bills to reach the Senate floor, and all I ask is that we be permitted to proceed. Far be it from me, as the Senator from Nebraska knows, to waste the time of the Senate. If any Senator takes but a little part of the time of this body, I submit I am that one.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If any Senator likes to please his colleagues, it is the Senator from New Mexico. If any Senator wants to be tolerant, and wants to let other Senators do anything that is within reason, it is the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But I think that further delay in connection with items which are understood and which are non-controversial would be wasting the money of the taxpayers, about which my good friend from Michigan speaks.

So far as the Cordon amendment is concerned, I have stated to the Senator from Nebraska and to the Senate that I am willing to go along and proceed with the consideration of this bill, at least as to those items which are not in controversy, and then, if we are not ready to vote on the 5-percent cut recommended by the committee, let us wait.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senate gave unanimous consent that the bill might be reported when the Senate was not in session. That showed our good faith, as the Senator knows. I agree that the Senator from New Mexico is very expeditious in his work in the Senate, both as an individual and as a chairman, but why does not the Senator proceed with his statement and his report—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am trying to do that.

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment—and give us the benefit of it, without our now acting upon the motion to make the bill the unfinished business of the Senate. We should like to vote tomorrow on any amendment which may be offered. I think we would accomplish much by proceeding in that way. By the time the Senator has concluded his statement, and Senators have asked their questions, this matter will probably have washed itself out.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator makes such motion—

Mr. WHERRY. I have not made it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator moves that, after the Senate agrees to the motion to make the bill the unfinished business of the Senate, I may make an explanation of the bill, I shall be glad to consider it, and I shall be glad to consider even such a request, if made, instead of a motion.

Mr. WHERRY. It would please me very much if the Senator from New Mexico would assure Members of the Senate that, if the motion made by the distinguished majority leader should be adopted, any Senator who desired to offer an amendment to the bill might do so tomorrow, and that the amendment would be voted on at that time, the Senate might proceed today to consider the bill from beginning to end. If that were done I think no time whatever would be lost.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly not. We have lost enough time.

Mr. McFARLAND rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should first like to have a vote on the motion to make the bill the unfinished business of the Senate. If that motion is agreed to, and a request of the nature suggested by the Senator from Nebraska is made thereafter, I may say to the Senator I am not at all unreasonable about such matters. But I should like to have the motion of the majority leader, that the bill be made the unfinished business of the Senate, agreed to, and then let the Senate do as it pleases. I now yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me there is really nothing in the controversy. The Senator from Nebraska urges Senators to agree that a motion to reconsider may be made tomorrow. I may say to the Senator, it is unnecessary to agree to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. McFARLAND. Such a motion could be made anyway. On any amendment which is adopted, a motion may be made to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. McFARLAND. There is nothing in this proposal to prevent that being done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would have no objection, even to that.

Mr. WHERRY. Oh, no.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. McFARLAND. If an amendment were adopted, and if a motion to reconsider the vote by which it was adopted should not be made in the meantime, would it not be in order tomorrow to move such reconsideration?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion would be in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. It seems to me it would be impractical to proceed along

that line. It would become necessary to move to reconsider each item, in order to effect a reduction in the bill. Is it not impractical?

Mr. McFARLAND. No, I do not think it would be impractical. I do not think we would have any difficulty. We never have in such cases. When we come to the consideration of an item regarding which the Senator may want to make objection, I do not think the distinguished Senator from New Mexico would object to allowing the amendment to go over until tomorrow, or would object to agreeing that a motion to reconsider could be made. But the bill has not been made the unfinished business of the Senate, and it is impossible to make an agreement until that is done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to be fair. I understood the question of the Senator from Michigan. I am not going to answer any question until we find out whether the Senate wants to continue to waste the taxpayers' money, or whether we want to take up this bill and consider it now.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, according to one of the wisest of the 3,000 proverbs spoken by the world's wisest man, "In all labor there is profit: but the talk of the lips tendeth only to penury." For more than 5 months the Senate has, on the average, worked on this floor not more than an hour a day. During these 5 months when the Senate was in session, the talk of senatorial lips has consumed approximately 5 hours a day. In other words, we have spent 400 percent more time tending to poverty than we have spent in the production of profit. Today we have thrown away 45 precious minutes in uttering words as worthless as sounding brass and carrying on conversations as fruitless as barren trees.

Mr. President, I urge that works be forthwith substituted for words and that the Senate immediately proceed to perform its highly important legislative duties which have been far too long neglected. I give notice that during the further debate on the pending bill, I shall object to any Senator's yielding for any purpose except that of asking a question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Carlson	Ferguson
Anderson	Chavez	Flanders
Bennett	Clements	Frear
Benton	Connally	George
Brewster	Cordon	Green
Bricker	Dirksen	Hayden
Bridges	Douglas	Hendrickson
Butler, Md.	Duff	Hennings
Butler, Nebr.	Dworshak	Hickenlooper
Byrd	Eastland	Hill
Cain	Eaton	Hoey
Capehart	Ellender	Holland

Hunt	Maybank	Robertson
Ives	McCarran	Russell
Jenner	McCarthy	Saltonstall
Johnson, Colo.	McClellan	Schoeppel
Johnson, Tex.	McFarland	Smathers
Johnston, S. C.	McKellar	Smith, Maine
Kefauver	McMahon	Sparkman
Kerr	Millikin	Stennis
Kilgore	Monroney	Taft
Knowland	Moody	Thye
Langer	Morse	Underwood
Lehman	Mundt	Watkins
Lodge	Neely	Welker
Long	Nixon	Wherry
Magnuson	O'Connor	Wiley
Malone	O'Mahoney	Williams
	Pastore	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I withdraw my motion and ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3709; also that any Senator may have the right to offer tomorrow any percentagewise cut in the bill, and to except therefrom any item or items in the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I understand also that it is the purpose of the unanimous-consent request that if tomorrow an amendment is presented to make a percentagewise cut, exceptions to the amendment may be indicated.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator for the observation. He has stated it as clearly as it could be stated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I ask the majority leader if tomorrow all amendments would be limited to a percentage cut?

Mr. McFARLAND. Not necessarily so. We may not complete consideration today of all the other amendments.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Personally I am very much opposed to percentage cuts in appropriation bills. If we are to be limited to percentage cuts only, I shall have to object to the request.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator could present, at any time today, an amend-

ment providing for a reduction in any item, or he could ask for an increase in an item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. McFARLAND. Just a moment. The only object of the unanimous-consent agreement is to make sure that percentagewise amendments may be offered after the committee amendments are adopted, if it is desired to offer such amendments. Senators would have that right any way.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, may I ask further whether the Senate would be limited, after the committee amendments are disposed of, to considering only amendments which would represent percentage cuts, rather than amendments to reduce particular items, or increase particular items?

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if I correctly understand the unanimous-consent request, it is as follows: It is intended to be used by Senators who would propose cuts greater than the committee has suggested. The proposed agreement would apply only to percentagewise cuts. However, there is nothing in the agreement which would prevent the Senator from Washington, or any other Senator, from offering an amendment changing the figures in the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If that is the understanding, I will not object.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator to explain for the RECORD what he means by percentage cuts.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me explain the object of the unanimous-consent request. Technically, if a committee amendment were agreed to today, it could not be amended tomorrow by a percentagewise cut, unless the Senate reconsidered the committee amendment. The purpose of the unanimous consent agreement proposed is to get around that parliamentary situation.

Mr. AIKEN. By a percentage cut, does the Senator mean a motion made after the amount for each item is arrived at, to cut the entire bill a certain percentage across the board?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes; except that it may be desired to exclude certain items from the cut.

Mr. AIKEN. I find myself very much in agreement with the Senator from Washington, that that is no way for the Senate to do business. However, like the Senator from Washington, I should like to know whether the proposed agreement would preclude any other amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. No, it would not preclude other amendments. As I stated before, the purpose is to get around the parliamentary situation.

Mr. AIKEN. I am referring to an amendment to cut a particular item.

Mr. McFARLAND. Such an amendment may be offered today.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the reason for postponing until tomorrow a motion for a percentage cut? Why not offer such an amendment today, and make it the regular order?

Mr. McFARLAND. The purpose is to get around the parliamentary situation which exists because of the committee amendments. If committee amendments are agreed to, in order to amend them it would be necessary to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendments are agreed to. However, certain Senators do not want to do that. They wish to make a percentagewise cut in all the items in the bill when it is ready for final consideration.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I think I can explain the situation to the Senator. The bill came to us with the Jensen amendment, which is a limitation upon filling vacancies. The subcommittee spent several days on the problem, and finally the subcommittee and the full committee adopted what we call the Cordon amendment, which is a different formula from the Jensen amendment. However, it relates to personnel. It excludes hospitals, heart and cancer work, and things of that kind.

Then we had a proposal for a 10-percent cut. First it was to apply to personnel. Now we understand that it may apply to appropriations for heart and cancer work, as well as appropriations for hospitals. We certainly cannot cut the retirement funds. They are fixed by law. There is a question whether we want to cut aid to the States for medical work, and things of that kind.

The committee has cut the bill \$100,000,000 below the House figure. Some Senators wish to cut it still more. It is a very technical thing to arrange the consideration of the bill and the committee amendments in such a way that Senators may have more time. Some Senators want the vote on the major cut to go over. The Cordon amendment would make a reduction of a little more than \$2,000,000; and a 10-percent reduction would be nearly \$5,000,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would be more than that. It would amount to approximately \$15,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON. It would be more than that if it applied to hospitals. The Cordon amendment excludes hospitals and certain types of research work. It does not exclude other types of research work. We went as far as we felt we were justified in going. Therefore we hope to be able to vote today. Any Senator who wishes to increase an appropriation for an item, such as for heart, cancer, or hospital care, may do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Or cut any item.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; and tomorrow it would be possible to move to reconsider any committee amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In other words, it would be necessary to submit an amendment today in order to be able to vote on it today?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If we did not do so today, we would be foreclosed from doing so tomorrow?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Tomorrow it would be necessary to move to reconsider.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. AIKEN. I join the Senator from Washington in objecting.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to add that I hope the Senate will vote to consider the bill today. We cannot force the bill through over the objection of Senators who wish to vote tomorrow. If they wish, they can talk about Acheson or the two Britishers who went behind the iron curtain. They can talk about anything they desire to talk about. It would be possible to keep the Senate from voting. Certainly we should be able to start voting today and go as far as we are able to go.

We are about to take up the first appropriation bill. It is a month late in coming to the Senate. We have 13 or 14 more appropriation bills to come before us. We cannot possibly conclude consideration of them before the end of the fiscal year. The newspapers are already criticizing the Senate for not making any progress.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which considered appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency began its consideration of the bill on the 3d day of April. We held long hearings and arrived at some conclusions. The delay in making it possible for the Senate to proceed in an orderly way with regard to the bill, which is the first appropriation bill to be presented to the Senate this year, was brought about by the fact that the Senator from Michigan stated he desired to submit some amendments to cut the bill further than the committee has suggested.

I do not take my hat off to the Senator from New York or any other Senator on humanitarian matters. I do not take off my hat to the Senator from Michigan in trying to save the taxpayers' money.

In the presence of the Secretary of Labor and in the presence of representatives of the Federal Security Agency, at the start of the hearings on April 3, the chairman of the subcommittee made the following statement. I wish the Senator from Michigan, in his great desire to economize, could be here to listen to the statement. A copy of it was sent to every Senator. I said:

CAREFUL SCRUTINY OF BUDGET NECESSARY

Senator CHAVEZ. The committee, as the Secretary will understand, is confronted this year with a somewhat different problem in its consideration of budget estimates. There is the necessity to provide adequately for the defense of our country, for which we have a tentative estimate in excess of \$60,000,000,000. There is before the Congress a recommendation from the President proposing a substantial increase in taxes, which, in view of the fact that the cost of living has increased beyond salary increases, will, if enacted, result in a lowered standard of living for our citizens. It is incumbent upon the Congress then to study with infinite care these requests for public moneys. We are not faced with a Treasury surplus—rather a deficit of billions; and one way to meet a deficit is to reduce expenditures.

The record will show that this subcommittee, our Committee on Appropriations and the Senate and the Congress have all

supported the programs of the Department of Labor, of the Federal Security Agency, and of the related independent agencies. We have through the years allowed substantially what was requested. At this point though it seems that the estimates as a whole, from each and every constituent agency, must be reduced in the interest of Government solvency. Some programs which admittedly are providing worth while and necessary services may have to be cut back—just as we are calling upon the individual citizen to get by on less this year than he had last year.

We proposed to afford to the representatives of each constituent agency an adequate opportunity to justify and explain fully their requests for funds. I wish the fiscal position of our Government were such that we could allow the estimates in their entirety. But the millenium has not yet arrived so we must be governed accordingly.

DEVIATIONS FROM PURPOSES OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS

Over the past few years there has been a movement underway to merge appropriation accounts; to remove limitations, and proscriptions with reference to the use of funds. This program was predicated on the premise that it would enable the departments to do a better administrative job and the Congress could rely upon strict observance of the pleadings for funds as to what they would be used for.

Increasingly the committee is observing the departments and agencies after receiving the appropriations in lump sums, obligating the funds with scant attention to the details of the justifications presented to the committee and to the Congress. When questioned as to the validity of such departures from the justification details, the stock answer is that the appropriating language imposed no observance of justifications.

Moreover, the committee has found instances of fund transfers and use directly contrary to the express instructions of Congress as embodied in committee reports. And while this flagrant flaunting of congressional will may not be illegal we shall be most disappointed if ever it occurs again.

CLOSER CONTROL OF EXPENDITURES REQUESTED

If we permit this to continue, the taking of testimony is a fruitless and meaningless task in the absence of language in the bill to require observance of justifications. I call the attention of the agencies to this point and remind them that any further deviation from justifications can result in the appropriation by categories, by activities, or by object of expenditure; or the inclusion of a general provision stipulating that the funds are appropriated for the purposes and objects set out in the justifications. I propose to have a close check made in this regard on behalf of the committee throughout the coming months, and I hope that the agencies will not invite punitive action.

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF REQUIREMENTS

Earlier this year I directed the staff to obtain for the committee a full and complete explanation of the proposed obligation by objects with respect to each appropriation account.

At this point let me say that when the bill came from the House, about the only question the Senate committee would investigate was whether some item which the House had cut should be restored.

I read further:

Heretofore the presentation has been an explanation merely of the increase sought by object of expenditure. That is to say, if the agency sought \$5,000 for travel, one of the objects of expenditure, which represented an increase of \$500 over the previous

year's allowance, then the explanation and narrative justification dealt only with the increase—why the additional \$500 was needed—without bothering to explain the other \$4,500.

I am informed that there have been presented to the committee fairly detailed explanations of the proposed obligation of funds by object for each appropriation account. I find these explanations extremely interesting and informative, and I hope we can introduce this data into the record for the information of the committee and the Senate.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PATTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The statement from the hearings which the Senator has been reading is very valuable and interesting to a number of Members of the Senate, but many of us wish to know whether we are going to have this bill taken up for consideration. I understand that if the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee will agree that the controversial items may go over until tomorrow, for voting, there will be no objection to having the bill brought up at this time.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask what is to be regarded as a controversial item in that connection? How will that be determined?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there is only one matter which actually is in controversy in connection with this measure, namely, the substitute for the so-called Jensen amendment. Of course there may be differences as to certain items; for instance, some Senator may believe that an item which the committee cut \$50,000,000 should have been cut \$55,000,000, or that an item which the committee increased by \$3.50 should instead be decreased \$10. However, as a matter of fact, the committee report is practically unanimous on the money items. The real controversy comes on the so-called Jensen amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am confused about the parliamentary situation. I yield to no one in my admiration for the humanitarian instincts of the Senator from New Mexico, but there are certain items in which many of us are particularly interested, notably, those concerning public health, cancer, heart disease, mental health, and research.

The report on this bill came to the Senate only a short time ago. None of us has had a chance to study the report or the bill as reported. Certainly the public is completely uninformed regarding the report. It is very possible that I may wish to submit amendments increasing some of the allowances reported by the committee. When will I be able to do so?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is nothing to prevent the Senator from submitting amendments; he can submit them now

and he can change them tomorrow, as he wishes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to have an answer to this question: If I decide that I wish to submit amendments of that sort, must they be submitted and acted on this afternoon or will a reasonable time be allowed?

Mr. ROBERTSON. If I may reply, I should like to say that the amendments the Senator may submit will be acted on when we reach the items of the bill to which the amendments apply. Amendments to the committee amendments must be submitted when the particular committee amendments to which they apply are reached.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to explain the parliamentary situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. This bill is subject to a point of order if the bill is brought up today. I think we can save time by agreeing to let any controversial items go over until tomorrow. Such an arrangement frequently is made. In that case, any committee amendment which a Senator wishes to have passed over, can be passed over. We shall save time by following such a procedure.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as I have stated to the Senate heretofore, generally at this time of the year there are four or five appropriation bills which have been passed by the House of Representatives and have been passed by the Senate and are in conference. However, in the present case this is the first appropriation bill for the new fiscal year which has come to the Senate. I do not wish to rush action on this bill. On the other hand, I should like to have the Senate begin to consider the bill and I should like to have a vote on the bill reached promptly. I shall be willing to agree that we vote tomorrow afternoon or even Saturday or Monday, provided we begin with the bill and at least make some progress on it. Senators talk about economizing and saving money for the Government and reducing the cost of the Government; and certainly we shall save time and money and cost to the Government if we proceed within reason, allowing each Senator to submit any amendment he desires to submit.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The difficulty is that we cannot do that if a point of order is made against consideration of the bill today.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I demand the regular order.

Mr. McFARLAND. I understand that the matter now under discussion is the regular order; and I desire to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question, if he will yield for that purpose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to ask whether the distinguished Senator will agree to give the Senate assurance that, if the bill is taken up today, after the Senator from New Mexico makes his explanation and the Senate adopts all committee amendments about which there is no controversy, any amendments

which Senators wish to have passed over until tomorrow will go over until that time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have no objection to that procedure.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. First, let me point out to the distinguished Senator that, as he well knows, the Senate has a right to require that the report on the bill lie over 1 day.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question as to that.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from New Mexico is asking the Senate to forego that right and to take up the bill immediately. I say to the distinguished Senator—and I think I express the sentiments of many Members on this side of the aisle and of at least some Members on the other side of the aisle—that a number of Senators are requesting that the Senator from New Mexico proceed with the bill and make any explanation of it that he wishes to make, but they feel that they should have a right to offer, tomorrow, amendments calling for cuts or increases in appropriation items before those items are finally voted on.

In view of the fact that the bill could lie over 1 day, anyway, I do not believe such a request is unreasonable.

I should like to agree with the suggestion of the majority leader; in fact, I would agree, so far as I personally am concerned. On the other hand, I am not sure that all other Senators will agree, because many of them are not sure what items in the bill are controversial, and some which are considered controversial today might not be considered controversial tomorrow, and vice versa.

I wish to cooperate with the Senator from New Mexico. Why do not we agree to the motion to take up the bill at this time, with the full understanding that no votes will be taken until tomorrow, and that any Senator who wishes to offer an amendment may do so at any time either today or tomorrow, even though we may approve today certain committee amendments calling for increases or decreases in salary items in the bill? What is wrong with such an arrangement?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. Let me ask what is wrong with this—and I hope the Senator will give me his attention—

Mr. WHERRY. Yes; but another Senator on this side of the aisle just said that objection might be made to that arrangement, and I was wondering what was wrong with it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Well, what is wrong with this? Some Senators think they may wish to submit amendments tomorrow? That will be perfectly satisfactory to me. I am trying to cooperate with Senators on the other side of the aisle in respect to economizing and using to advantage the time of the Senate this afternoon, at least to the extent of adopting the amendments as to which there is no con-

troversy, and trying to reach an agreement that if Senators offer amendments tomorrow, at least we may agree about the time when amendments which are passed over temporarily will be voted on and also when amendments which are submitted tomorrow will be voted on. Can we agree to vote at, let us say, 5 o'clock tomorrow, or to begin voting then?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I did not know that question was to come up.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am asking the Senator, What is the matter with it?

Mr. WHERRY. The junior Senator from Nebraska is perfectly ready to start on the bill today, and to vote on it today; but, speaking for Senators who are not present, I must insist that their rights be protected, and, therefore, that the bill lie over for 1 day. I do not object and I am sure those Senators would not object to taking up the bill having a full discussion of it, with an explanation of every item, and voting on the committee amendments as fast as desired. But I certainly think Senators should have the right tomorrow to offer any amendment to increase or decrease any appropriation, whether it involves salaries or other items of the bill. That is not unreasonable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course; and I would not think it unreasonable if my good friend from Nebraska even wished to economize.

Mr. WHERRY. And, of course, I do.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am trying to be of assistance along that line.

Mr. WHERRY. But there are Senators who want to increase the total amount of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would there be any objection to fixing a time for the vote?

Mr. WHERRY. No. So far as I am concerned, if the distinguished Senator wants to make a unanimous-consent request that we proceed to the consideration of the bill and that tomorrow an amendment may be offered to increase or decrease any salary item or any other item of the bill, and that there be a limitation of debate beginning, say, at the hour of 4 o'clock, with 30 minutes on each amendment, I should not object. I believe the Senate would be agreeable to a limitation of debate of any amendment. But I want Senators to be able to offer any amendment they desire, to any item of appropriation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So do I.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, may I ask if it is his understanding that, under his proposition, if the bill is taken up today and the committee amendments are voted on—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Except those which some Senator asks to have go over until tomorrow.

Mr. AIKEN. That any committee amendment adopted today would be subject to an amendment tomorrow, in case a Senator found out during the night that the amount should be increased or decreased?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator knows that it is possible to move to reconsider, and there will be no objection, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is probably correct about that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There will be no objection. If any amendment which may be adopted this afternoon should appear to a Senator overnight to have been wrongfully adopted, and if he wants to move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to, and to propose an amendment to it, the Senator from New Mexico will have no objection.

Mr. AIKEN. I have participated in this debate for two reasons. First, I am strongly opposed to requiring the President of the United States to assume the responsibility which is given to the Congress in regard to making appropriations and fixing amounts. I may say also that during the past 10 years, I have seen many appropriation bills come into the Senate, Senators finding them on their desks, and passing them within a matter of 3 or 4 hours' time on the same day. It seems to me that is not good legislative practice.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the Senator is possibly correct. But there are certain items of the bill which are not controversial, and we can gain a little time by acting on them today. I simply do not want to waste the time of the Senate. I thought we might at least make a little headway.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think the situation is apparent. As a matter of fact, I thought the report had been filed yesterday; otherwise, I should not have moved to take up the bill. The only way we can take up the bill is by unanimous consent, and it is obvious that the only way we can get that done is to agree that any amendment may be offered tomorrow, either to amendments or to the bill. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, and that any Senator, tomorrow, may have the right to offer an amendment to any amendment, or to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That is agreeable.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it to be understood that up to the time of the final consideration of the bill, any Senator may offer an amendment?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Any Senator may offer an amendment, either to increase it or to decrease an item. Is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. That is exactly what I said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other pur-

poses, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to continue reading the statement I made in the subcommittee at the time the Secretary of Labor and representatives of the Federal Security were before it. That was on April 8. I want my good friend from Michigan to turn to page 2 of the hearings. At the beginning of the hearings—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator from Arizona for suggesting the unanimous-consent agreement. I think it solves all our problems.

Mr. CHAVEZ. At the beginning of the hearings, in order to carry out what I think the Senator from Michigan and I may say, practically all or, indeed all other Senators have in mind in the way of giving consideration to the financial status of the country, the load of the taxpayer, and the waste of public moneys, I made a statement which I now desire to read. At page 4 of the report, I said:

FISCAL PROBLEMS TO REQUIRE CLOSE ANALYSIS OF BUDGET ESTIMATE

The members of our committee are cognizant of the difficult problem with which we are confronted. The Congress has a responsibility to the American people to protect the solvency of our Government and to maintain a balanced economy. We hope that witnesses on behalf of the departments will be so guided. I hope we will not be subjected to witnesses stoutly defending as essential, programs and activities linked with certain nostrums and panaceas. It is going to be difficult enough to win approval of funds for bona fide essentials; the spectacle of witnesses consuming the time of the committee in behalf of some luxury item may well result in a disallowance of funds for even essential projects.

It is the hope of the committee that the departments and agencies affected by this appropriation bill will, of their own volition, tell the committee where cuts can be made and show the Congress and the American people that the departments understand the economic situation as it exists and are, therefore, willing to be austere themselves. That procedure will be preferable—that is, to have the departments do their own cutting and so state to Congress; but, if necessary, this committee and the Congress must do the cutting.

Now, what I have in mind, Mr. Secretary, by that last statement is this: I am sure that, as far as the higher echelons of Government are concerned, the ones who really have the responsibility of carrying out the administrative duties of every department, they realize the situation in the country as it exists. This is stern reality. We are in an awful mess. If it is at all possible within reason to have nonessentials cut I think that would be so much more preferable. I think the departments would stand in better grace with the Congress if the departments themselves were to tell us, "Now, listen, members of the committee, while it is true that we would like to carry out this particular program, as in everyday affairs of life, we can't always do what we want, even for our own immediate families and we are going to suggest that these cuts be made by the committee."

Now, Mr. Secretary, at your convenience, we will be glad to hear whatever you care to say.

That statement, Mr. President, was made because the committee fully appreciated its position and understood that it had grave responsibilities to the American taxpayers. Throughout the hearings that very point was in mind.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to what the committee did in the way of appropriations and in reducing certain appropriations. If the Members of the Senate will turn to pages 1 and 2 of the committee report—they will note that the amount of the bill as passed by the House was \$2,641,206,361. The Senate committee lowered that amount to the net extent of \$112,867,530, the total amount of the Senate bill being \$2,437,192,064.

The budget estimate for 1952 was \$2,744,253,760. The bill as reported to the Senate, which is in the amount of \$2,528,338,831, is \$91,146,767 above the 1951 appropriation, but it is under the budget estimate in the amount of \$215,914,929.

Let me again emphasize that the amount of the bill as passed by the other House has been reduced by \$112,867,530, and the appropriations provided are \$215,914,929 under the budget estimate for this year. That reduction was made after extensive hearings extending from the third of April until approximately 2 weeks ago. The subcommittee went deeply and extensively into every detail, as was intended when I made my statement at the start of the hearings.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

I should like to invite attention to the breakdown of the reductions and how they compare with past appropriations, budget estimates, House allowances, and Senate allowances.

On page 2 of the committee report it will be noted that in 1951 for the Department of Labor there was appropriated \$230,906,360. The budget estimate this year was \$231,289,000. The House allowed \$223,506,500. The Senate committee's recommendation was \$223,536,601.

The appropriation is practically \$7,000,000 lower than was the appropriation for 1951, and it is \$7,752,399 below the budget estimate, but it is \$30,101 above the House allowance.

The reason why I give the Senate those figures—and I wish my friend from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] were present on the floor—is in order to show that the subcommittee and the full committee desire the Senate and the people of the country to understand that we appreciate the financial condition of the Government and the condition of the taxpayers.

The Senate committee's allowance for the Federal Security Agency is approximately \$25,000,000 under the allowance for 1951; it is \$157,087,395 under the budget estimate, and approximately \$62,000,000 under the House allowance.

Generally, Mr. President, as those who know the history of appropriations in this body are aware, when the House did any cutting the Senate would, as a general rule, increase the amount of the appropriation. The Senate was supposed to be the restoring body. But, again, the subcommittee, including such Senators as the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], who is the ranking minority member, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], other Senators, and myself, wanted to show the country that we were endeavoring to make a little saving wherever it was possible and within sound reason, and without jeopardizing the carrying out of the proper functions of Government. We did not want to jeopardize one single essential function of Government, and we do not think that what we have recommended will have that result. We thought then and think now that every penny of the appropriations the committee has suggested to this body is absolutely essential, and we cut only as to those functions which possibly could wait in whose appropriations a cut was justified. That does not mean that the subcommittee or the committee as a whole does not believe in the programs being carried on; we do believe in them. They include hospital construction and public health activities. I am satisfied that more money could be used in these programs to the advantage of the welfare of the United States, but, under the circumstances, we feel that the committee allowed all that could be justified at the moment.

With reference to the National Labor Relations Board, the committee recommends an amount, \$328,541, under the 1951 appropriation and \$348,541 under the budget estimate. But we increased by \$233,959 the House allowance. We felt justified in doing that, and, as we come to the amendments which pertain to those items, they will be justified.

The next item is the National Mediation Board. As to that item the Senate committee's recommendation is \$11,753 under the House allowance, \$59,753 under the budget estimate, and \$360,253 under last year's appropriation.

In the case of the Railroad Retirement Board, there is an increase of \$124,529,495 compared with 1951 appropriations. At the time that item comes before the Senate for consideration, we will justify it. But the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee is \$50,465,591 under the budget estimate for 1952, and \$50,465,591 under the House allowance.

In the case of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the appropriation recommended by the Senate committee is \$96,050 above the 1951 appropriations, \$201,250 below the 1952 budget estimates, and \$96,750 above the House allowance.

Mr. President, I believe the figures shown by the tables appeal to those who want the Government to function on a sound basis and to have it properly administered. We must have a government, Mr. President. We have created

the agencies in question. We have created the programs administered by the agencies. We have written certain philosophies in the law, and it is necessary that Congress provide adequate funds, not to be wasted, in order to carry out the proper functions of government that should be carried out in a country such as ours.

Mr. President, I am proud of the record of the subcommittee. I am proud of the cuts it has made. As I stated, the cuts were made in many instances reluctantly, because individual members of the subcommittee believed in programs in which they were particularly interested. I wish we had been able to recommend a larger sum than was requested by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] for a particular item in which he was interested, and in behalf of which he appeared before the subcommittee. Having heard the testimony given by my good friend before the subcommittee, I am positive he believes that what we allowed was all that could be allowed at this particular time.

Mr. HUNT rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish we had been able to recommend a larger appropriation for cancer research. If I could have had my way I would have allowed \$20,000,000 more for that activity, and I would have allowed more for research into heart ailments.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will yield to the Senator from Wyoming in a moment.

More than 900,000 persons suffering from mental illness are inmates in public institutions, without considering those who are being taken care of privately by individual families. It is my contention that American citizens, the families of the unfortunates, and the public officials who deal with them, have a sacred trust to perform. The Senator from New Mexico is not happy over the little mite we allowed for research and investigation of mental illness in the United States. The Senator from New Mexico, however, has a duty to perform, and the subcommittee members felt that what we allowed was all we possibly could allow at the moment.

I now yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that the junior Senator from Wyoming is very grateful to him for the way he and his subcommittee received him, and for the amount of increase that was allowed. While perhaps we would have liked to receive and could well have used more money, we are well satisfied with the action taken by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Delaware. I should have yielded to him previously. However, my attention was distracted, and I apologize to the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I desire to invite the attention of the Senator to the item in the appropriation contained in the bill referring to the Railroad Retirement Board. What is the obligation of the Government with

respect to the Retirement Board? I ask the question so we may have the answer in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from Delaware has a copy of the bill before him, I suggest that he turn to page 38.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that in connection with that Board the United States Government is trustee for this fund?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Under the law the fund goes into the Treasury, and necessary money must be appropriated by Congress. The money to meet current retirement payments, to set up the reserve retirement fund, and to meet administrative costs, all come out of the special tax for this fund. It does not come out of any money raised by what we call taxes placed upon the taxpayers of the country generally.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This is the way it applies in a practical way. So much of the tax is collected from the employer and so much from the employee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is how I understand it, and my reason for asking the question is so we may have the record straight.

The next question is: That being true, is not the \$50,000,000 to which the Senator refers false economy?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; it is not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator cannot claim that the \$50,000,000 represents a cut in the bill, because it is not our money in the first place.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; it is not false economy, as the Senator states.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But, so far as the ultimate answer is concerned, it is immaterial whether it is paid out this year or next year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. It happens that in this instance it is money that we have previously overpaid the agency.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But it is still money paid by the railroad employees and the railroad companies that we are handling as a trust fund.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. This is money that was overpaid, and which we are now holding from the appropriation of the trust.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator explain to us how he arrived at the \$50,000,000 cut?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We arrived at the \$50,000,000 cut for the simple reason that we had overpaid that amount, and reduced it to that extent.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that; but I did not see anywhere a breakdown of this amount. It is not exactly \$50,000,000. I simply wondered where I could find a breakdown of the amount. The amount is \$50,465,591, so there must be a breakdown of it somewhere.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is. Let me read from page 11 of the report of the com-

mittee, under the head of "Payment to railroad retirement account":

The committee recommends, as a substitute, provision for an annual specific appropriation in lieu of the annual indefinite as passed by the House and the permanent indefinite as proposed in the budget estimate.

The committee recommendation is \$50,465,591 less than the budget estimate and the House allowance, neither of which recognized the credit outstanding for prior years' overpayment, resulting from the overestimating of net tax collections upon which figure the annual specific appropriation has been based, adjusted for prior years' experience.

If the Senator will turn to page 837 of the hearings, he will find a table headed "Comparison of carriers' tax collections with amounts appropriated to the Board for railroad retirement purposes and benefit payments, by fiscal years, 1936-51."

In the summary the Senator will note how we arrive at the \$50,000,000:

Summary

Total amount of appropriations chargeable to tax collections, 1936 through 1951 (column 5)-----	\$4,395,201,269.16
Net carriers' tax collections, 1936 through 1951 (column 6)-----	4,344,735,677.72
Difference-----	50,465,591.44

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator for that information. I should like to ask one further question. I notice that the bill still calls for an appropriation of \$91,000,000 more than the appropriation for 1951. Unquestionably this is a domestic agency. If every domestic agency is to have its appropriations increased this year, and in addition we have our military appropriations, from what source is there going to be any economy in the Government? Just why should it cost \$91,000,000 more to operate this civilian agency?

Mr. CHAVEZ. This is another year. Conditions are different than they were in fiscal year 1951. During the past 12 months, or since the fiscal year 1951 started, conditions have arisen which were unknown at that particular time. Irrespective of the merits of the question, we are in an emergency, and Congress has taken certain legislative steps in order to meet the situation. Of necessity, the Government load has increased. That is the reason, in this particular instance, why there is an increase in the appropriation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is true that certain new agencies have been created during the emergency, but—

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understood, the question was in general terms. So far as it applies to this particular bill—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was not asking for a specific breakdown at this time; I am referring to the increase.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; but let me point out the situation so far as this particular bill is concerned, because that is what we are dealing with at the moment. I am proud of the effort of the committee

to make reductions. Let me read the following general statement from page 3 of the report:

The committee recommends a total of \$2,528,338,831, a reduction of \$112,867,530 under the House allowance, and \$215,914,929 under the 1952 budget estimates, but \$91,146,767 more than the 1951 appropriations. The substantial increase over the 1951 appropriations results partially from the abandonment of contract authority—there was provided \$100,000,000 in contractual obligation authority for the hospital and school construction programs during the current fiscal year but for which fiscal year 1952 new obligation authority in the form of cash is provided. Another major factor in the increase is the additional allowance for payment to the railroad retirement account, \$124,529,485 more than the 1951 appropriation, but with respect to which the Congress has little effective control, the appropriation being the estimated net tax collections under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act, adjusted for prior payments.

That was the reason for the increase. However, notwithstanding the increase in this particular item, as a whole, as compared with what the budget contained, and what the House allowed the bill, as reported by the Senate Committee is still \$112,000,000 lower than the House figure.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I feel sure that the Senator from New Mexico will agree with me that we must cut much deeper than 3 or 4 percent below the estimates if we are to balance the budget or come anywhere near it. We must make most of the cuts in the civilian departments of the Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Delaware is correct. However, the Senator from New Mexico has his own views as to a complaint about a \$40,000 item in the Department of Labor when we are appropriating billions of dollars. I have my own views on that question, which I shall express at the appropriate time, when appropriations for particular agencies are reached.

My individual opinion is that some of the so-called foreign aid could be curtailed to a great extent. I wish we had a little more money for our hospitals. I wish we had a little more money for flood protection. In my judgment, a flood is just as devastating, if not more so, and does just as much damage in the Missouri or Mississippi or Hudson River Valleys, or in New Mexico, as does a flood which occurs in Europe. At least I am more concerned about it, anyway. I think we owe just as much of an obligation to our own people as we do to the people of Europe. So I believe we could reduce some of the appropriations for foreign aid, and possibly carry out the purpose which the Senator from Delaware has in mind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator have available the number of civilian employees in the various agencies referred to in this bill, as compared with the number of employees for the past 2 or 3 years. I ask for this in order that we may see whether or not the agencies are reducing the number of their employees, as they should be doing?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have the information, and I will furnish it to the Senator. It so happens that it does not appear in the hearings, but we have it. We required that information of the agencies.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Am I to understand, it will be available before the bill is passed?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I will furnish it to the Senator during the afternoon.

Mr. President, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement, I believe that the Senate would be justified in adopting the committee amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNING in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	Millikin
Anderson	Hennings	Monroney
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Moody
Benton	Hill	Morse
Brewster	Hoey	Mundt
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Ives	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Cain	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Carlson	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kem	Schoeppel
Clements	Kerr	Smathers
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Taft
Duff	Lodge	Thye
Dworshak	Long	Tobey
Eastland	Magnuson	Underwood
Eaton	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Maybank	Welker
Ferguson	McCarran	Wherry
Flanders	McCarthy	Wiley
Frear	McClellan	Williams
George	McFarland	Young
Green	McKellar	
Hayden	McMahon	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1) to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 652) for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2918) for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff.

SENATOR WATKINS' FIGHT FOR REVISION OF THE ITALIAN PEACE TREATY

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] deserves special commendation for the fight he has been carrying on for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty of 1947.

When the Italian Peace Treaty was brought before the Senate for ratifica-

tion, the Senator from Utah argued that the treaty would render Italy militarily helpless in the face of Communist aggression and would deny her the means of self-preservation. He pointed out that the reparations provisions of the treaty would saddle Italy with economic servitude and would impede her recovery. He charged that the territorial and other provisions of the treaty were departures from the announced principles of the Atlantic Charter.

That was some 4 years ago. The Senator from Utah has never let up in his fight for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty. His most recent activity is illustrated by a clipping I have before me from the May 31, 1951, issue of the New York Times. It is a published letter to the editor in which the Senator from Utah restates the need for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty. I request unanimous consent that his letter and the editorial to which it refers be inserted at the conclusion of my remarks in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibits A and B.)

Mr. KEM. In April 1951, when the troops-for-Europe issue was before the Senate, the Senator from Utah proposed an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 99 expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should seek to eliminate the provisions of the Italian Peace Treaty which impose limitations on the military strength of Italy and today prevent her from carrying her proper share of the burden for the defense of Western Europe. The Senate, by a vote of 67 to 20, adopted that amendment.

The persistent campaign of the Senator from Utah for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty has won him many friends and supporters, especially among Americans of Italian ancestry. He has received hundreds of messages of encouragement and praise from all over the United States and from abroad. The letters he has received from Italy have been especially warm and enthusiastic. The following paragraph from a letter to the Senator from Utah from Ambrogio Ranzini, of Italy's National Ex-Servicemen's and Veterans' Association, illustrates how Italians feel about the Senator:

Excellency, for your defense of Italy and your insistence on justice for my country and because yours is the voice of a friend overseas, I, an Italian, want to extend to you my gratitude. I know that we have humble but good Italians over here who are able to do their share in bringing about true peace in the world and the triumph of civilization; men who in their hearts feel love for all nations, on whom the United States will always be able to count as good friends, real Italians who want neither communism nor slavism.

The Italian language press in America has been equally enthusiastic in its praise of the Senator from Utah. One such newspaper, *La Follia di New York*, carried a front-page editorial in its March 15, 1951 issue under the headline: "A name that Italians must not forget—ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican Senator of Utah."

The lead sentence of that editorial said:

Here is a name (ARTHUR V. WATKINS) which Italy must write with letters of gold into the annals of its modern history.

I am proud to be associated with the Senator from Utah in his fight for revision of the Italian Peace Treaty. I hope that before many days are out the Department of State will heed the will of the Senate of the United States as shown by its recent adoption of the Watkins amendment, and will move for revision of the treaty. Italy must be placed in the position so that she can do what she wishes to do, that is, contribute her fair share for the defense of the West, against the world-wide threat of Communism.

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of May 31, 1951]
REVISING ITALY'S TREATY—HALT TO REPARATIONS, SUPPORT FOR APPLICATION FOR U. N. SEAT ADVOCATED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES: The editorial Italy's Peace Treaty, which appeared in your May 22 issue, was most disappointing. The Times draws a distinction between the preamble and the clauses of the treaty and cautiously notes that "the time is doubtless soon approaching when Italy will formally and officially apply to the Big Three for revision of the clauses of the peace treaty." The concluding sentence of the editorial expresses the cautious hope that "when that time comes there should be no hesitation in agreeing to the proposal."

On April 2, by a vote of 67 to 20, the United States Senate adopted the Watkins amendment to Senate Resolution 99, expressing "the sense of the Senate that the United States should seek to eliminate all provisions of the existing treaty with Italy which impose limitations upon the military strength of Italy and prevent the performance by Italy of her obligations under the North Atlantic Treaty to contribute to the full extent of her capacity to the defense of Western Europe." In view of this expression of the viewpoint of the United States Senate, the initiative for revision of the Italian peace treaty should have been taken by the Department of State some weeks ago. To date, nothing has been done.

Now comes the New York Times to suggest that "the time is doubtless soon approaching" for Italy formally and officially to "apply" for revision of the clauses of the peace treaty.

PAYMENTS TO RUSSIA

The Times contends that the proposal for the discontinuance of Italian reparations to Russia pursuant to the requirements of the Italian peace treaty poses a problem which "is delicate and complicated and will need study" because it "impinges on the whole vast problem of reparations, not only to Russia but to other allies and not only of Italy but of Germany and Austria."

In my view, Italy, Germany and Austria cannot be expected to make an effective contribution to the economic, political and military strengthening of Western Europe so long as they are compelled to pay tribute to Russia or any of the other military victors of the Second World War. Continued insistence on the letter of the post-war punishments which were visited upon war-torn and devastated "losers" in the Second World War is contradictory of all efforts to bring those nations back into the European family and into the United Nations. Thus, there should be little hesitation in rejecting the nervous note of caution voiced by the Times in respect to the "problem" of reparations.

The Times editorial of May 22 finds it "hard to see the necessity for 'abolishing' the preamble of the Italian peace treaty," inasmuch as it merely "states the historic fact that Italy joined with Germany and Japan in making war on the Allies" and "history cannot be rewritten or expunged from the records."

ALLIES' PLEDGE

It should be pointed out that the preamble of the Italian peace treaty does more than state a few facts of recent history. It is in the preamble that the Allied and associated Powers specifically promised "to support Italy's application to become a member of the United Nations." It is significant to note that that pledge, which was solemnly subscribed to 4 years ago, has been openly repudiated by one of the signatories, Soviet Russia, through the repeated (four times) use of the veto power to block Italy's request for admission to the United Nations.

The effort of the other signatories to bring about fulfillment of the pledge have not been so marked by determination and vigor as to inspire spontaneous widespread belief in their sincerity.

It occurs to me that the United States should open its eyes to reality in respect to the Italian peace treaty. The treaty has been repudiated and nullified by Russia. It should be denounced by the United States. The very least we can do is press for its revision.

ARTHUR V. WATKINS,

United States Senator from Utah.

WASHINGTON, May 28, 1951.

EXHIBIT B

[From the New York Times of May 22, 1951]

ITALY'S PEACE TREATY

Count Sforza has again proposed that the Italian Peace Treaty be revised. The timing of this request a week before the crucial municipal elections was doubtless calculated. At the height of the electoral campaign in the spring of 1948, a judicious declaration by the United States, Britain, and France favoring the return of Trieste to Italy undoubtedly gained votes for the anti-Communist side. This time the same countries are unfortunately prevented from expressing an opinion by the agenda talks now fruitlessly taking place among the Big Four in Paris. The United States, for instance, cannot on the one hand fight to get the Russian satellites to observe their peace treaties and on the other destroy the terms of the Italian Peace Treaty.

However, this is a technicality that one hopes will soon be removed. The satellites, with Russian incitement and help, have armed far beyond the limits set in their treaties. To force Italy to keep within the limits prescribed in her own treaty is dangerous folly. Treaties cannot be violated by one side and made sacred and binding on the other. It is not that any number of wrongs make a right but that international relations must live up to certain accepted norms. When the basis for such relations is broken the superstructure cannot be held up.

The point that Count Sforza makes about Italy being forced to supply Russia with war materials as reparations at a time when the west is trying to embargo such goods is well taken. However, it impinges on the whole vast problem of reparations, not only to Russia but to other allies and not only of Italy but of Germany and Austria. The problem is delicate and complicated and will need study. In addition, it is hard to see the necessity for abolishing the preamble of the peace treaty, as Premier de Gasperi recently suggested. It states the historic fact that Italy joined with Germany and Japan in making war on the allies. With all

due respects to the Russians, who are past masters at the art, history cannot be rewritten or expunged from the records.

The time is doubtless soon approaching when Italy will formally and officially apply to the Big Three for the revision of the clauses of the peace treaty. When that time comes there should be no hesitation in agreeing to the proposal.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief observation before we proceed. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, nothing can be done until tomorrow; or, stating it in other language, anything which is done today can be undone tomorrow. That being the case, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc, except those in controversy, and except the amendments which are to be offered from the floor, as to which the chairman of the subcommittee has given proper notice of motions to suspend the rules, to enable those amendments to be offered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object, as I understand the request—let me say that the Senator from Michigan, for himself and other Senators, will offer an amendment. In order that the Senate may know what it is, I shall read it:

On page 42, lines 15 and 16, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 703. Each appropriation or authorization made by this act for any purpose, of which a specified portion is herein made available for personal services, and each amount so specified as being available for personal services, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think I understand the purposes of the amendment, and what the amendment is designed to accomplish. I have no objection to having it discussed, either this afternoon or tomorrow, in order that proceedings on the bill may be expedited. I presume that the amendments which are to be submitted tomorrow will not affect the entire bill, and that we could at least get through with certain of the committee amendments, and then, if any Senator wanted to amend any part of the bill, that could enter into the picture. That is my reason for making the unanimous-consent request at this time.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from New Mexico designate amendment "A" as a controversial amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. Let me tell the Senator from Maryland as to that. I

shall have to move to suspend the rules in order to offer that amendment, because it proposes basic legislation. It will not come up until the other committee amendments shall have been adopted.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe that the Senator from Maryland will possibly agree to vote to suspend the rules, because it is very necessary that the amendment be adopted in order to carry out the purposes of the Wherry Act so far as the institution referred to in the amendment is concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that all committee amendments, with the exception of the so-called Cordon amendment and the amendments lettered "A" and "B," as to which I have given notice of motions to suspend the rules, be adopted en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I take it that, as a consequence of the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from New Mexico, we would under his proposal adopt all noncontroversial committee amendments and then, tomorrow, consider such committee amendments as may be objected to and amendments formulated and offered from the floor, including amendments to the appropriations made by the House. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct. The only thing which will be accomplished, in the event my request is granted, is that as to amendments which are not objected to, and which are not intended to be amended, we will not be required to go through this same process again tomorrow.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The consequence would be that we would not be able to discuss the budget this afternoon, or be able to act on the budget this afternoon.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I want the Senator to discuss it this afternoon, if he desires, and I would have no objection if he would propose a modification to my request, or would care to have me modify it, so that the discussion of the bill and the budget figures, or whatever the Senator may have in mind with reference to the bill, could proceed this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it the intention of the Senator to carry on tomorrow and push for final passage tomorrow?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not necessarily. It would be my hope that we could reach a final vote tomorrow; but it is not my intention to press for a vote until every Senator interested has had an opportunity to have his say. But I think agreement to my request would expedite matters and would actually save time which might otherwise be consumed in going over the same amendments which we could take up now, provided there is no objection to them, and tomorrow we could, if desired, even return to such amendments; otherwise, their consideration will have been completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. LEHMAN. Reserving the right to object, I am concerned about one phase of the request. I think the Senator from New Mexico and my other colleagues realize that I am as anxious as anyone on this floor to have legislation expedited. As a matter of fact, I frankly have been very critical of delays on the part of the Congress in enacting certain legislation, so that my very deep interest is in getting important legislation enacted as promptly as possible. Nevertheless, it seems to me that as to a bill so important as is this one, going into many phases of our national life, there should be a reasonable amount of time given for the consideration of the report and the bill, and for discussion.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to my good friend from New York an agreement has already been reached as to time for consideration of the bill. All I now ask is that in order not to waste time tomorrow with amendments of the type referred to by the Senator, the Senate proceed under the unanimous-consent agreement which has been arrived at. We have not agreed on any particular time to vote.

Mr. LEHMAN. If I may continue my thought for a moment, I am very much interested in some of the items in the bill. My present tendency is to consider submitting amendments which might even increase the appropriation for certain health measures and other measures which I think are of great interest.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My request will not prevent the Senator from submitting amendments.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not desire to submit any unless I have substantiating data and evidence which would justify them. I am in receipt of telephone calls and have had visits from persons deeply interested in the treatment of cancer, in hospitals, and in various other health activities. I do not wish to submit amendments unless I have the facts. On the other hand, I do not want to fail in my duty toward the people and toward sound activities. I do not intend to object to the request, but I believe we should have time to consider the report and the bill carefully, to listen to the debate, and to hear from some of our constituents.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the reason why I agreed to the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered, and the noncontroversial committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The committee amendments, agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

Under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary," on page 2, line 13, after the word "public," to strike out "\$1,425,000" and insert "\$1,400,000, of which not more than \$1,250,136 shall be available for personal services."

In line 16, after the word "Solicitor," to strike out "\$1,650,000" and insert "\$1,669,445, of which not more than \$1,530,546 shall be available for personal services."

On page 3, line 10, after the figures "\$683,000," to insert "of which not more than \$604,870 shall be available for personal services."

In line 23, after the word "Marine", to strike out "\$277,000" and insert "\$265,758, of which not more than \$213,603 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Apprenticeship," on page 4, line 5, after "(29 U. S. C. 50)", to strike out "\$2,692,000" and insert "\$2,578,682, of which not more than \$2,153,049 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Employment Security," on page 4, line 20, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$4,635,500" and insert "\$5,245,959"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "\$743,500" and insert "\$1,513,765"; and in line 23, after the numerals "1944", to insert "and of which not more than \$4,351,773 shall be available for personal services."

On page 5, line 11, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$165,560,000" and insert "\$164,560,000, of which not more than \$647,037 shall be available for personal services, and"; and in line 13, after the word "which", to strike out "\$6,000,000" and insert "\$5,000,000."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Employees' Compensation," on page 7, line 19, after the word "Appeals", to strike out "1,947,000" and insert "\$1,887,816, of which not more than \$1,618,499 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Bureau of Labor Statistics," on page 9, line 7, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$5,243,000" and insert "\$5,371,352, of which not more than \$4,530,755 shall be available for personal services."

In line 16, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$1,125,000, of which not more than \$991,323 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Women's Bureau," on page 9, line 22, after the word "exhibits", to strike out "\$389,000" and insert "379,285, of which not more than \$317,581 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Wage and Hour Division," on page 10, line 11, after the word "Division", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$8,365,304, of which not more than \$7,119,227 shall be available for personal services."

Under the heading "Title II—Federal Security Agency—Columbia Institution for the Deaf," on page 11, line 13, after the word "improvements", to strike out "\$390,000" and insert "\$374,537, of which not more than \$293,805 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Food and Drug Administration," on page 12, line 7, after the word "operations", to strike out "\$5,345,000" and insert "\$5,172,975, of which not more than \$4,218,475 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Freedmen's Hospital," on page 13, line 8, after the word "university", to strike out "\$2,906,500" and insert "\$2,631,500, of which not more than \$2,053,786 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Howard University," on page 13, line 18, after the word "grounds", to strike out "\$2,525,000" and insert "\$2,415,084."

Under the subhead "Office of Education," on page 14, line 20, after "(Public Law 462)", to strike out "\$18,223,261" and insert "\$20,017,760"; in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$18,048,261" and insert "\$19,847,760"; and in the same line, after the word "year", to strike out the colon and "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations."

On page 15, line 20, after the word "same", to strike out "\$3,253,000" and insert "\$3,397,706, of which not more than \$2,893,577 shall be available for personal services, and."

On page 16, line 9, after "(Public Law 874)", to strike out "\$28,000,000" and insert "\$40,000,000: Provided, That this appropria-

tion shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such act."

On page 16, after line 11, to strike out: "Grants for school construction: For grants for emergency school construction to school districts in federally affected areas as authorized by the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority provided under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951: *Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall be available for reimbursement payments under section 205 (c) (1) of such act with respect to school facilities completed before July 1, 1951: *Provided further*, That in determining relative urgency of need for purposes of prescribing, under section 206 (d) of such act, the order in which certifications for payments from this appropriation shall be made (other than payments in liquidation of contractual obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1951), the Commissioner shall give special consideration to the extent to which the school facilities are needed in the interests of national defense."

On page 17, after line 5, insert:

"SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

"For providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by title II of the act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority granted for the foregoing purpose in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951."

Under the subhead "Office of Vocational Rehabilitational," on page 17, line 24, after the word "agency", to strike out "\$20,475,000" and insert "\$21,500,000, of which not more than \$87,346 shall be available for personal services, and."

On page 19, line 2, after the word "films", to strike out "\$705,000" and insert "\$675,620, of which not more than \$558,220 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Public Health Service," on page 20, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twenty"; and in line 13, after the word "determine", to strike out "\$11,700,000" and insert "\$11,653,360, of which not more than \$2,786,157 shall be available for personal services."

On page 20, line 17, after the word "act", to strike out "\$8,745,000" and insert "\$8,887,351, of which not more than \$2,140,323 shall be available for personal services."

On page 21, line 3, after the figures "\$15,960,000", to insert "of which not more than \$1,900,944 shall be available for personal services."

On page 21, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "twenty" and insert "thirty"; and in line 13, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$6,090,000" and insert "\$5,915,747, of which not more than \$4,450,816 shall be available for personal services."

On page 22, line 1, after the word "only", to strike out "\$3,710,000" and insert "\$3,648,158, of which not more than \$2,885,004 shall be available for personal services."

On page 22, line 19, after the word "aircraft", to strike out "\$1,234,000" and insert "\$1,211,129, of which not more than \$434,547 shall be available for personal services."

On page 23, line 8, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$175,000,000" and insert "\$195,000,000."

On page 23, in line 19, after the word "only", to strike out "\$1,195,000" and insert "\$1,166,465, of which not more than \$1,017,165 shall be available for personal services."

On page 24, line 20, after the word "only", to strike out "\$2,990,000" and insert "\$2,-

868,029, of which not more than \$2,507,458 shall be available for personal services."

On page 25, line 8, after the word "compounds", to strike out "\$15,500,000" and insert "\$15,559,973, of which not more than \$4,560,505 shall be available for personal services."

On page 25, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "four" and insert "six"; and in line 20, after the word "act", to strike out "\$19,500,000" and insert "\$19,805,171, of which not more than \$2,694,760 shall be available for personal services."

On page 26, line 3, after the word "diseases", to strike out "\$10,300,000" and insert "\$10,737,974, of which not more than \$1,178,489 shall be available for personal services."

On page 26, line 11, after the word "only", to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$10,072,982, of which not more than \$1,463,333 shall be available for personal services."

On page 26, in line 17, after the word "conditions", to strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert "\$1,697,308, of which not more than \$1,001,156 shall be available for personal services."

On page 27, line 4, after the numerals "1950", to strike out "\$10,400,000" and insert "\$9,445,000, together with \$955,000 to be derived by transfer from funds provided for the construction of additional auxiliary structures under this head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1951."

On page 27, line 19, after the numerals "1951", to strike out "\$350,000" and insert "\$250,000."

On page 27, line 22, after the word "head", to strike out "\$6,640,000" and insert "\$6,635,540, of which not more than \$84,740 shall be available for personal services."

On page 28, line 9, after the word "officers", to strike out "\$1,790,000" and insert "\$1,861,500, of which not more than \$731,500 shall be available for personal services."

On page 29, line 2, after the word "only", to strike out "\$2,850,000" and insert "\$2,745,868, of which not more than \$2,320,514 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "Social Security Administration," on page 29, line 23, after the word "unions", to strike out "\$175,000" and insert "167,650"; and on page 30, line 1, after the word "law", to insert "of which total sum not more than \$614,650 shall be available for personal services."

On page 30, line 7, after the word "than", to strike out "\$58,000,000" and insert "\$57,437,980"; and in line 9, after the word "fund", to insert "of which not more than \$48,697,378 shall be available for personal services."

On page 30, line 24, after "64 Stat. 477)", to strike out "\$1,250,000,000" and insert "\$1,150,000,000."

On page 31, line 5, after the word "Assistance", to strike out "\$1,463,400" and insert "\$1,600,000, of which not more than \$1,455,400 shall be available for personal services."

On page 31, line 12, after the word "distribution", to strike out "\$1,450,000" and insert "\$1,500,000, of which not more than \$1,238,900 shall be available for personal services."

On page 32, line 6, after "(42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V)", to strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$33,000,000"; and in line 10, after the word "State", to strike out the colon and the following additional proviso: "Provided further, That this appropriation shall be allotted on a pro rata basis among the several States in proportion to the amounts to which the respective States are entitled for the current fiscal year by reason of section 331 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950."

On page 32, line 18, after the word "Security", to strike out "\$219,700" and insert "\$200,000"; and in line 19, after the word

"exceed", to strike out "\$110,300" and insert "\$100,000."

Under the subhead "Office of the Administrator," on page 33, line 15, after the word "Administrator", to strike out "\$2,050,000" and insert "\$2,150,000"; and in line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$403,000" and insert "\$413,000."

On page 34, line 4, after the word "fund", to insert "of which total sum not more than \$402,045 shall be available for personal services."

On page 34, line 12, after the word "Counsel", to strike out "\$412,000" and insert "\$396,478."

On page 34, line 22, after the word "health", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$75,000."

Under the heading "Title III—National Labor Relations Board," on page 36, line 15, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$8,000,000" and insert "\$8,233,959, of which not more than \$6,622,284 shall be available for personal services."

Under the heading "Title IV—National Mediation Board," on page 37, line 7, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$400,000" and insert "\$394,247, of which not more than \$299,307 shall be available for personal services."

On page 37, line 15, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$150,000" and insert "\$144,000, of which not more than \$114,000 shall be available for personal services."

Under the subhead "National Railroad Adjustment Board," on page 37, line 22, after the figures "\$600,000", to insert "of which not more than \$460,774 shall be available for personal services and."

Under the heading "Title V—Railroad Retirement Board," on page 38, after line 6, to strike out:

"Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits, in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said acts as specifically provided for under this title, for crediting to the railroad retirement account, an amount equal to amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during the current fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (28 U. S. C. 1500-1538)."

And in lieu thereof to insert:

"Railroad retirement account: For an amount sufficient as an annual premium for the payments required under the Railroad Retirement Acts of August 29, 1935, and June 24, 1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the railroad retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the latter act, \$562,534,409: *Provided*, That such total amount shall be available until expended for making payments required under said retirement acts, and the amount not required for current payments shall be invested by the Secretary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937."

On page 39, line 10, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$5,268,000" and insert "\$5,056,904"; and in line 11, after the word "account", to insert "of which not more than \$4,010,820 shall be available for personal services."

Under the heading "Title VI—Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service," on page 40, line 2, after "(5 U. S. C. 55a)", to strike out "\$2,949,000" and insert "\$3,047,000, of which not more than \$2,566,653 shall be available for personal services."

On page 40, line 11, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$48,750, of which not more than \$23,750 shall be available for personal services."

On page 42, line 16, to change the section number from "704" to "703."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on page 42 of the bill, lines 15 and 16. It is a new section of the bill. I ask that the amendment be incorporated at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. BYRD, Mr. WHERRY, Mr. TAFT, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. DIRKSEN) to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, was received, ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 42, between lines 15 and 16, insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 703. Each appropriation or authorization made by this act for any purpose, of which a specified portion is herein made available for personal services, and each amount so specified as being available for personal services, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to speak for a few minutes on the amendment.

WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THIS AMENDMENT?

It cuts the amounts for personal services specified in the bill by an amount corresponding to 5 percent of the budget request for such personal services.

HOW IS THE CUT APPLIED?

It is applied to these money items:

First. Those appropriations which include personal services; and

Second. The amounts specified therein as being available for personal services.

This is not a double cut. It is necessary to apply the cut to both items, however, since otherwise we would be cutting the amount available for personal services but leaving that amount still in the appropriation and free for expenditure as other expense.

It does not apply to items which the committee had already reduced, for personal services, by 5 percent or more. It does not apply to such items because they do not appear in the bill as specified for personal services under the language the committee incorporated in making its reduction through a limitation.

WHAT WILL BE THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF PERSONAL SERVICES CUT IF THIS AMENDMENT PREVAILS?

Ten percent of the amount for personal services requested in the budget. The committee cut personal service appropriations item by item, 5 percent of the budget estimates. We are repeating that process but in a single package rather than item by item. The final result will be a cut of 10 percent in the amounts for personal services requested in the budget.

TIDELANDS OIL—AMENDMENT TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 20

Mr. HILL. Mr. President. On behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], and myself, I am submitting an amendment which at the appropriate time we intend to propose to section 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 20.

As Senators know, the resolution provides for the continuation of operations under certain mineral leases issued by the respective States covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf. The resolution, as I understand it, proposes to continue the orderly development of oil and gas deposits in the submerged lands during the period the Congress decides how to implement the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States in which that Court decided that the United States does own the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to the shores of California, Louisiana, and Texas, and that such States do not own the submerged lands of the Continental Shelf adjacent to their boundaries.

In *U. S. v. California* (332 U. S. 19, June 23, 1947) the Supreme Court stated without equivocation that "California is not the owner of the 3-mile marginal belt along the coast." And in *U. S. v. Texas* (339 U. S. 704, October 16, 1950) the Court settled for all time this controversial argument between the United States and the several States by holding that the ownership and proprietary rights to this marginal sea, as well as the governmental powers of regulation and control, was in the United States of America as a whole.

We are offering our amendment in order that it may be considered by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs as well as by the Senate. In this way our colleagues may study and consider its purposes and effect.

At this time I do not propose to discuss the section 5 in the present bill except to point out that its effect may be to nullify the decisions of the highest court that this oil belongs to all the American people—all the people—from Alabama to Massachusetts, from Connecticut to Oregon, from Maine to Illinois, from New Hampshire to Tennessee, from Wyoming to Vermont—through their proud claim as United States citizens—not merely to the people of three or four States whose claim is no more than that they were born next door to the oil deposits.

The provisions of the amendment are simple. It proposes to achieve three things:

First. The money from this oil, this public-lands resource of the Nation, is to be dedicated now for the long-range needs of the education of the Nation's children—all its children—and placed in a special account in the Treasury of the United States.

During the present critical period, however, the funds are to be used for national defense purposes. They shall be employed only for urgent developments essential to the national defense

and the national security, such developments to be specifically determined by the Congress. Thereafter, this special account shall be devoted to our children's education, exclusively as grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

Second. A National Advisory Council on Grants in Aid of Education shall be created. It shall be the function of that Council, which should be named immediately after the resolution becomes law, to study and develop a plan to be reported to the President, who shall submit the report to the Congress not later than February 1, 1953, for the equitable allocation and use of the income from this oil capital for primary, secondary, and higher education.

The Council will consist of 12 persons with experience in the fields of education and/or public administration. Four are to be appointed by the President of the Senate, four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and four by the President of the United States.

The function of this Council is not to be in substitution for the work that is being done to provide Federal aid to elementary and secondary education out of tax revenues. The Federal royalties from these oil deposits cannot be expected to be uniform from year to year, and it is contemplated that the Advisory Council will therefore report on how they can best be utilized as an extra fund out of which can be provided Federal assistance to primary, secondary, and higher education, in addition to such essential aid as the Congress may provide as regular support to education.

It should be emphasized that the proposal in this amendment will not conflict in any manner with, and in fact is a logical extension of the policy which led to the establishment of our prized system of land-grant colleges under the Morrill Act. The endowments and grants under the Morrill Act will continue as they have in the past. It may well be that part of these funds could be used to supplement statutory land or equivalent money endowments of the Morrill Act. It is certainly clear that all the money which has poured into the States under the terms of the Morrill Act in past years would only be a drop in the bucket compared with the funds the several States would receive under this proposal.

Third. Every State or political subdivision which has issued any mineral leases or grants covering submerged lands of the Continental Shelf, and every grantee of such State or political subdivision shall file with the Attorney General of the United States by December 31, 1951, a statement of the money or other things of value received by such State, political subdivision, or grantee thereof from such leases or grants. The Attorney General shall submit those statements to the Congress not later than February 1, 1952. The object of this provision is to find out what benefit particular States have already had from this property which belongs to all the people.

These three points are the essence of the amendment.

The amendment does not in any way change or effect the provision in the resolution which reads as follows:

Thirty-seven and one-half percent of all moneys received as bonus payments, rents, royalties, and other sums payable with respect to operations in submerged coastal lands lying within the seaward boundary of any State shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury to such State within 90 days after the expiration of each fiscal year.

This is a generous grant to the tideland oil States.

I sincerely hope that my good friends from California, Louisiana, and Texas, who are fighting so hard to get all of these funds for their own States, will not feel that we are trying to take away from them funds on which they feel the success of their own educational enterprises depend. No sponsor of this amendment wishes to harm the education of children in California or Louisiana or Texas, even though I understand that the great oil fortunes of Texas have already richly endowed education in Texas. Those of us who sponsor this amendment do so, among other reasons, to awaken the Congress and the people of the United States to an understanding of the vastness of the treasure involved—a treasure so vast that there is more than enough to go around; a treasure so vast that to give the children of the other 45 States of the Union their fair share of what belongs to the people of those 45 States as well as the 3 States of California, Louisiana, and Texas, does no injustice to education in those 3 States, even as it does justice to the cause of education in the other 45 States. We feel that one of the reasons for the very possessive attitude of the 3 States which are trying to take a disproportionate share of this treasure of all the States, as well as the comparative lack of interest by the other States, is the little knowledge in all 48 States of the size of the resources involved.

There has been much speculation about the amount of money available to the Treasury of the United States from Tidelands Oil. There can be no really precise determination until the report of the Council proposed by this amendment shall have been submitted to the Congress. I think it would be most helpful to Senators, however, to have the benefit of one or two informed guesses. More than a year ago Dr. E. L. GeGolyer of Dallas, Tex., who has an international reputation as one of the most outstanding petroleum geologists of the world, if not the outstanding, stated in *Life* magazine that there may be 10,500,000,000 barrels of oil along the Texas and Louisiana coasts. This figure of 10,500,000,000 barrels excludes oil along the coast line of Florida, Mississippi, and California. The Geological Survey of the Department of the Interior has estimated there may be 13,000,000,000 barrels on the Continental Shelf off Texas and Louisiana. It has also estimated there are 2,000,000,000 barrels off the coast of California. If this Geological Survey estimate of 15,000,000,000 barrels is correct and if today's available price of crude oil is

around \$2.70 a barrel, the 15,000,000,000 barrels are worth \$40,500,000,000—more than \$40,000,000,000 belonging to all the people of the United States.

What proportion of this total capital value of oil in place would accrue to the Federal Government in royalties in any given year would, of course, depend on future legislation. What proportion of this total resource in oil would be withdrawn in any year and over a particular period of years may depend upon many things—the going price and the necessity for finding new sources in oil; the shifting reasons of public policy that will dictate whether this oil is to be withdrawn quickly or deliberately conserved over a period; the discoveries of oil elsewhere; the effect of price in the world market; and the availability of substitute forms of power. It is just because of these many factors that the tidelands oil royalties will probably not be available as a fixed amount accruing each year, in contrast to tax funds, which are annually available for the support of the most distressing needs of education.

Whatever the combination of circumstances may be, it is certain that the Federal royalties from whatever amount of this treasure is withdrawn from year to year or over a period of time offer the greatest opportunity to American education since the dedication of a large proportion of our public lands to educational purposes through the land-grant colleges. It is a part of the American tradition and belief in education that our public lands should be dedicated in substantial part to the creation of an even greater public resource—an educated citizenry. Today as we face the crisis of finances in American education we cannot but wish that we had accepted the advice of that far-sighted Massachusetts statesman, President, and Member of Congress, John Quincy Adams, who many years ago attempted to dedicate the public lands of the United States to the particular purposes of public education.

The attempt to dedicate our public lands to the establishment of our land-grant colleges received its most resounding defeat in the nineteenth century from the pen of a President with lesser vision, James Buchanan, when he vetoed the first Morrill Act. It was only when Abraham Lincoln, mindful of his own desperate youthful efforts to educate himself, came to the Presidency that the vision of Adams became a part of the imagination of Lincoln, and grants of public lands were made to establish our land-grant colleges. I commend to our Republican colleagues the Lincoln tradition.

The action of the Supreme Court invites again the wisdom and vision of John Quincy Adams and Abraham Lincoln. Like a lost Atlantis rising from the sea, modern technology has created, from a source of which we had never dreamed, new public lands in the newly extractable oil deposits lying beneath the sea. We are given a second chance to endow American education from our public lands after we have wasted far too much of our first chance.

The amendment which we jointly sponsor asks the Congress to realize how vast is this opportunity and responsibility. It is the big chance belonging to the whole Nation rather than a chance for only three or four States. No Senator from any State of the Union fails to realize the crisis in our American educational system and how aware of that crisis his youthful constituents are. No Senator is unaware of the increase in the birth rate in this country. The sudden increase in preschool-age and school-age children has placed an unprecedented strain upon our whole educational structure. The parents and the officials of every town, city, and county in all 48 States are immediately and directly concerned at the family level with the solution of this educational problem. It has become so crucial that last fall *Life* magazine, with 25,000,000 copies per issue, devoted an entire issue—the issue of October 16, 1950—to education. It has become so crucial that here in the Capital the Washington Post has increasingly devoted more of its editorial and news space to the question in a series of articles which last week received a national prize for excellence.

Neither parents nor children nor history will forgive any of us if we repeat the error of the Congress which ignored Adams, when modern technology has given us a second chance. We cannot stand in default and lay our failure to inability to understand the significance of this second chance.

In the critical days in which we now live there is one priority—national defense. Other purposes must give way to this priority until this Nation is so well prepared, so strong that the Russian aggressor will not dare to move.

Because this is so self-evident our amendment proposes that, for the present, tidelands money be used for national defense and national security. This shall be only for extraordinarily urgent and essential developments, selected by the Congress, to relieve the taxpayers of that amount of further tax burden. We therefore propose deferring for the present the actual use of this money for educational purposes.

But we must not defer either the dedication of these funds to education or the study of what specific uses for education these funds should be devoted. The National Advisory Council on Grants in Aid of Education provided by this amendment, eight to be selected by the legislative branch and four by the executive branch, should begin now to determine the most pressing of the many needs of education. A most painstaking and detailed examination is required.

There is no choice here between advantages and disadvantages. Every group, every sector of American education has its back against the wall. Our school buildings are overcrowded. The grammar schools of our Nation are in the next 4 years to receive the largest number of children in the history of the United States. Our postwar babies have come of age—school age. This tidal wave of 6-year-olds will soon inundate the rickety structure of primary education which already is tottering under its pres-

ent load. Every State in the Union needs grammar-school teachers, needs new grammar-school buildings. And exactly the same thing is true of our high schools.

Our colleges, whether they are State universities, land-grant colleges, or private colleges are in equally severe financial straits. As taxes and inflation cut down endowments and the capacity of alumni to give, as legislatures have trouble raising additional educational funds, the prices for necessary personnel, services, and equipment, for maintenance and repair, all school operating costs, are skyrocketing.

While the sponsors of this amendment look to this asset as a source of help to the primary and secondary school systems, we feel most strongly that it must also be seen as a source, as a Government Rockefeller Foundation or Ford, Guggenheim, or Carnegie Foundation, out of which means can be provided for assistance to higher education and research which is just as desperately needed. Thus will we be able to maintain as a Nation our level of widespread human competence and keep ahead in the complicated technical efficiency upon which our very survival in this turbulent world may depend.

We hope that out of a study by a competent advisory council of 12 men appointed in the manner provided by the amendment some intelligent and equitable way may be found to help relieve the agonizing difficulties of colleges and universities, medical schools, dental schools, nursing schools, technological schools, and research institutions, by some techniques such as scholarships and grants-in-aid for specific training and research projects. In this way every child in America, irrespective of the financial circumstances of his parents, gets his chance at the fullest development of his highest abilities for the sake of the usefulness of those abilities to the Nation itself. And he does so without any cost to the taxpayer when we use income on the tidelands capital, given to us without taxes by Providence.

Institutions of higher learning in the United States today are in desperate financial difficulty. I doubt that the average salary of a full professor, but an assistant or associate professor, but one who has arrived at the top of his professional career—reaches \$6,000 a year. Some Members of this body would be surprised to know what has happened to the actual purchasing power of the scholarship endowments of our great universities. That scholarship endowment is the Nation's insurance of the development and the utilization of the genius that may be born in the humblest home.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I should like to conclude with my formal statement before I yield. I shall be very happy to yield later.

Those who served on the old Senate Committee on Education and Labor will feel as I do that improving the salaries of underpaid professors in colleges or underpaid teachers in primary and sec-

ondary schools may well be the most effective way of assuring a sound democratic philosophy for our students—your children and mine.

I have long been particularly interested in the dilemma of the medical schools because my father was a doctor.

I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article which was published in the New York Times of Sunday, June 3, 1951. The headlines read: "Lack of Funds Threatening Medical Education of Nation—Financial Crisis Faced by Major Schools, With Research Work Imperiled."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the report of the Public Health Services Committee on medical schools grants and finances has revealed that a minimum of another \$40,000,000 a year is needed at present enrollment levels and even more money is required to expand the physical facilities needed to teach medicine and train the doctors our country needs.

As compared to \$2,000 before World War I, it now costs about \$13,350 to provide a medical education. At that time the tuition fees were \$122 a year and covered 70 percent of the cost; today's tuition fees of around \$550 cover less than 25 percent. To raise the tuition any higher would mean putting the selection of medical students on an economic rather than ability basis. The Nation's 79 approved medical schools now have a combined deficit of \$10,000,000 a year, ranging from as little as \$67 in one school to more than \$1,000,000 in another. This deficit represents about 20 percent of their operating budgets. And what is true of the medical schools is true of our dental schools, our nursing schools, our technological schools, our liberal arts colleges, our whole system of primary and secondary education.

For too long some have looked upon this predicament as something about which we could do nothing. We have felt perhaps that our ambitions for our children were simply bigger than our capacity to meet them. But with this new Atlantis which Providence and science have given us from the bottom of the sea, we can now reach for our dream.

The need—the future of our children—is great. The means that has been put in our hands with which to meet that need is great. So let us think greatly and act greatly. We must not lose this opportunity. There is enough to go around if we use our assets wisely and far-sightedly. It will do this Nation little good in meeting its problems of tomorrow if the children of Louisiana and California are well educated from oil when their brothers and sisters from Alabama and Oregon, who must stand beside them in working out the problems of their generation, are not equally well educated, and only because they were not lucky enough to be born adjacent to the oil that belongs to the United States of America.

In this era of vast tides of migration from State to State, we must remember that there is no point in any particular State trying to make itself an insulated community concerned only for the education of the children who live within its own borders at a given moment. It is safe to say that many citizens of the Texas of today received their education in other States and at the expense of the taxpayers of other States. The huge influx of our people into California means that they were educated in a large part at the expense of and according to the standards of other States before they arrived. And when Louisiana really begins to make her own oil and gas hum in the Texas manner, she will become a migrant's El Dorado too. With the increasing problems of defense production, with the insistence that for security purposes such production take place behind our mountain States, it is not inconceivable that the nomadic movements of our people which were so apparent during World War II may again take place. In short, education and the fair sharing of resources for education, is a national as well as a State problem.

We who sponsor this amendment not only hope that our colleagues in the Senate will see the possibilities of good for the Nation in our proposal but we also dare to hope that there are businessmen in the great oil companies who will see these possibilities and deserve the accolade of business statesmen. Some of the biggest businessmen in our business world are in this industry. With the tremors that are communicating themselves from Iran to the whole world of oil, we hope those business statesmen may see in our proposal honest advantages of good will to the world of oil.

This is an opportunity to extend the public appreciation of the work of the Rockefeller Foundation; to identify big oil—in the minds of the rising generation that will shape public opinion and run the Government of this country long after we are gone—as the benefactor on a great national scale of educational opportunity which is the one common denominator of youth's ambition.

This is a business statesman's opportunity to have all the people of this country regard the oil industry as a friend as well as a great national resource, as a friend of every child educated in every State, as a friend of every parent of every child, rather than only the accumulator of tax-favored opportunities for a few.

I suggest to the business statesmen of big oil that in our proposal they may find a happy insurance policy which will guarantee that the attitude of the people or Iran toward oil will never—in the worst hardship or the worst depression—be the attitude of the people of the United States.

This is a chance for the statesmen of big oil—and I am sure they exist—to range themselves wholeheartedly on the side of the angels for the greatest good of the greatest number. This is oil's second chance as well as education's second chance and our children's second chance.

I hope big oil is big enough to have the wisdom to see the bigness of this chance for everybody.

EXHIBIT 1

LACK OF FUNDS THREATENING MEDICAL EDUCATION OF NATION—FINANCIAL CRISIS FACED BY MAJOR SCHOOLS, WITH RESEARCH WORK IMPERILED

(By Howard A. Rusk, M. D.)

A recent reader survey by a national magazine showed medical news ranking with sex and self-improvement as leading subject of interest to the public. Usually such news concerns scientific developments, new drugs, and new treatments that offer hope of curing some disease.

Within the last few weeks, however, there have been a number of big medical news stories that have dealt with something much more fundamental—the financial crisis in American medical schools.

The first of these was the report of the Public Health Service's Committee on Medical School Grants and Finances headed by Dr. Lowell J. Reed, Johns Hopkins University. In this detailed study on the financial and related problems in medical education and research, it was brought out that "a minimum of another \$40,000,000 a year is needed to cover the medical schools' operating expenses at present enrollment levels" and "even more money is required to expand the physical facilities needed to teach medicine."

The costs of medical education during the last 50 years have increased tremendously. As compared to \$2,000 before World War I, it now costs about \$13,350 to provide undergraduate medical training. At that time, the tuition fees of \$122 a year covered 70 percent of the cost; today's tuition fees of around \$550 cover less than 25 percent. To raise the tuition any higher would mean putting the selection of medical students on an economic rather than ability basis.

SCHOOLS FACE VAST DEFICITS

With rising costs, have less income from their endowments, because of lowered yield on investments, and less support from individual philanthropists, because of the increasing tax burden. The result is that the Nation's 79 approved medical schools now have a combined deficit of \$10,000,000 a year, ranging from as little as \$67 in one school to more than \$1,000,000 in another. This deficit represents about 20 percent of their operating budgets.

The urgency of this problem has been emphasized recently in the report of the commission on financing higher education, established by the Association of American Universities and financed by grants from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corp. This commission, consisting of six college presidents and six industrial leaders, noted the necessity for financial aid, but it went on record as opposing Federal aid to medical education, saying, "Until it has been clearly demonstrated that other sources of support cannot finance medical education, we believe no such great and potentially far-reaching innovation in Federal financing should be undertaken."

Instead they suggested:

1. More economies in medical schools.
2. Financing hospital care and other community services now provided by medical schools from local government appropriations for welfare purposes.
3. The payment of the full cost of such research by foundations, corporations, and other agencies supporting medical research.
4. Increased State appropriations, but not at the expense of other State-supported programs of higher education.
5. An increase in gift income.

Although laudable, the commission's proposals are not easy to achieve. As Dr. James

B. Conant, president of Harvard University, said the day after the commission's report: "If by economies they mean cutting budgets, of course, they can. If, however, by economies you mean saving money and doing an equally good job, I submit they are mistaken. * * * We are economizing and are paying a heavy price in not producing as many and the kind of doctors we should to take advantage of the great scientific discoveries of the century."

INADEQUACY OF PAY CITED

There is certainly one area in which further economy is not possible, and that is in the salaries of medical-school teachers. Although they are the foundation of medical education and must have years of training, most of our basic-science teachers in medical schools earn far less than journeymen. For example, one of the leading teachers of physiology in medicine today, an associate professor with a doctoral degree and 25 years of teaching experience, makes but \$7,200 a year. Many excellent young research men with as much as 10 years of experience are earning less than \$5,000.

It is readily apparent that our medical schools must have more funds and that these funds can come only from the Federal Government or from voluntary sources. Bills for Federal support of medical education have been introduced in each of the last several Congresses. The Association of American Medical Colleges and other groups have favored such legislation, but the American Medical Association has been opposed, fearing that Federal support might lead to Federal control. As an alternative the AMA has formed the American Medical Education Foundation to receive and distribute voluntary contributions to aid medical schools and it has suggested that each physician in the Nation give \$100 annually. If this goal were achieved, it would mean nearly \$18,000,000 a year in new income to our medical schools.

The AMA has merged its fund with the recently announced National Fund for Medical Education in which it is hoped that \$5,000,000 can be raised annually from private sources for distribution to medical schools. The new fund, which has the sponsorship of industry, the medical profession, organized labor, agriculture, and a group of university presidents and 12 scientific and educational foundations, has thus far raised \$1,000,000 from contributions by the medical profession and such other groups as 18 leading life-insurance companies and many industrial corporations.

An ambitious but extremely important project, the National Fund for Medical Education is a step in the right direction even if it solves only a part of the problem. Certainly, as Herbert Hoover, its honorary chairman, has said, it is a "significant development in the strengthening of the Nation's medical manpower."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSS], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] I submit the amendment, to be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT REGARDING THE REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND MARKETING OF SUGAR—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNING in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate Executive I, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a protocol dated August 31, 1950, prolonging for 1 year the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar, signed at London on May 6, 1937. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy will be removed from the protocol, and the protocol, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the message from the President will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of a protocol dated in London, August 31, 1950, prolonging for 1 year after August 31, 1950, the international agreement regarding the regulation of production and marketing of sugar signed at London on May 6, 1937.

I also transmit, for the information of the Senate, the report made to me by the Under Secretary of State with respect to this matter.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 7, 1951.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Under Secretary of State; (2) certified copy of protocol of August 31, 1950.)

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Reports of committees are in order. If there be none, the clerk will state the nominations on the executive calendar.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joe Warren Sheehy, of Texas, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomina-

tions of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. I now ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of these confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 8, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 7 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

IN THE NAVY

Alan G. Lewis (Naval ROTC) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy, in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed to correct name.

Richard Y. Kelly (civilian college graduate) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Rosemary D. Arenth	Betty R. Kunzman
Kathleen D. Beck	Diana McNair
Marion C. Brenner	Bertha S. Miller
Emily J. Byrd	Mary V. Moore
Nancy J. Chapman	Faye P. Overton
Shirley J. Clare	Frances MacD. Patch
Mary T. Connors	Bette J. Pickett
Yvonne C. Fossenkemper	Mary-Jeannette M. Rayner
Nellie M. Grieve	Louise B. Rogerson
Louise E. Griffin	Agnes I. Rupp
Elizabeth Hart	Mary E. Sheffels
George Hodges	Suzanne S. Shera
Mitzie L. Jacobson	Margaret F. Smith
Ethel R. Klein	Ann Thompson
Sibyl L. Kuhnle	Ruth V. Whitfield

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Elizabeth L. Childers
Clair Cook

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER

Rufus J. Pearson, Jr.

LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert H. Palmer, Jr. Roger P. Smitley
Clifford C. Roosa James N. Waggoner

Fitzhugh N. Hamrick to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Belva L. Coole	Rachel A. Nantz
Winifred L. Copeland	Virginia Marfia
June M. Elsesser	Margaret E. Nix
Evelyn C. Foht	Mary L. O'Donnell
Susan M. Hanley	Elizabeth Pope
Mary H. Harris	Julia E. Scarcello
Viola M. Hofer	Dorothy J. Shields
Regina M. Holland	Iris M. Stock
Wanda J. Humphrey	Mary T. Taylor
Barbara J. Hundiey	Annie R. White
Dorothy V. Krause	

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy, for limited duty only:

ENSIGNS

Albert Antar Arthur A. Bish
Harold S. Birdsong Donald "D" Butler

John J. Bramblett, Jr.	Aulcey D. Mosley
Francis E. Carnicom	Sylvester F. North
John T. Chiids	James P. Padgett
Earl D. Christensen	John K. Pegues, Jr.
John H. Church	Robert Pescott
Ernest L. Cobern	Everett R. Peugh
James E. Criner	Lloyd G. Peterson, Jr.
Peter DeilaRocca	Robert E. Pierce
Frank Dievendorff	Joseph E. Pinning
Charles A. Dodd	Harry B. Pitcher, Jr.
Philip M. Dyer	Wilbur P. Powers
Otis E. Engelman	Walter A. Ramsey
George J. Evans	Garlin R. Read
Julius E. Fuchs	Irvin W. Reed
Adolph J. Furtek	Albert R. Reid
Robert D. Gaie	Benjamin G. Sailors
Bernard H. Garrett	William G. Sandberg
Homer A. Giddens	Albert G. Sentman
Herman E. Goebel, Jr.	Elroy J. Shafer
William L. Halleck	George T. Sinclair, Jr.
Theodore P. Henrikson	Jack D. Smith
James "B" Hobbs	George Stenke
John C. Hounihan	Joseph St. Marie
Donnie W. Huckabee	Preston G. Thomas
William L. Hutton	Ted K. Tiliotson
Jack R. Ingram	William O. Thomson
Robert G. Jacks	Jackson M. Tomskey
Cecil King	Mike J. Trems
Everett N. Leach	John C. Valek
William R. Leibold	William McK. Viilines, Jr.
John D. Lewallen	Willard F. Waterfield, Jr.
Joe J. Lilienfeld	Arthur C. White
Eugene J. McGuire	George W. Whitman
George W. Macauley	Raymond O. Wilkinson
Armando E. Mancini	William R. Yarwood
Richard E. Mikkelson	
Peter E. Moil, Jr.	
Robert L. Moore	

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only:

ENSIGNS

Donavon E. Abraham Lowell A. Reade
Charles H. McKenzie Clarence E. Reed
George W. Nelson

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy, for limited duty only:

ENSIGNS

David H. Bodtke
Robert A. Martin

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 7 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Joe Warren Sheehy, to be United States district judge for the eastern district of Texas.

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

Ross A. Hancher, Elwood.
Claude B. Holder, Hope.
Norman Bretz, Huntingburg.
Paul V. Gelger, Markie.
Frank S. Anderson, Salem.

MASSACHUSETTS

Harper T. Gerry, Shelburne Falls.

MICHIGAN

Lillian M. Dewey, Aiden.
Thomas H. Branigan, Auburn.
Charles E. Wesner, Buchanan.
J. Donald Van Sickle, Carson City.
Arthur G. Warlick, Jr., Colon.
Vernon P. McGuire, Detour.
Albert C. Johnston, Palmyra.
John S. Miller, Rapid River.

NEW YORK

John D. Allardice, Hudson.

PENNSYLVANIA

William Lester Davis, Peach Glen.

WASHINGTON

Hugh A. Miller, Granite Falls.
Sanford M. Lord, Kelso.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JUNE 7, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. McCORMACK.

Rev. Paul J. Harrell, pastor, Memorial Baptist Church, Arlington, Va., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, ruler of the universe, remembering Thy commandment "to have no other gods before Thee" and realizing that such priority is right and good, we pledge to Thee our highest allegiance. Keep us true to that pledge that we may be true to ourselves, our work, and our Nation.

Spirit of the Living God, fall fresh upon us. Invade the shore lines of our lives and instead of repulsing Thee with self-sufficiency and pride, as so often we have, we will welcome Thee as the rightful possessor and ruler of our lives.

We know, O God, that no one can improve the world so drastically and speedily as is now needed except Thyself, but we know You will not change it apart from our cooperation. Direct today the President, this body, and all who seek to cooperate with Thee toward that end. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 75. An act authorizing the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and incidental works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, together with certain appurtenant dams and canals, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) entitled "Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union"; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. McMAHON, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONTESTED ELECTION OF RAYMOND W. KARST v. THOMAS B. CURTIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the Clerk of the House which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on House Administration and ordered printed:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1951.
Honorable SPEAKER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: From the contestant in the contested election case of Raymond W. Karst against Thomas B. Curtis for a seat in the Eighty-second Congress from the Twelfth Congressional District of Missouri, I have received a statement including a motion to dismiss his intention to contest the seat of the returned Member in the said district.

This communication is transmitted to the House for reference to the appropriate committee.

Very truly yours,

RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I instructed my secretary, John P. Baxter, to secure a pair for me against H. R. 314, a bill to provide for the establishment of a veterans' hospital for Negro veterans. I find that the RECORD shows that I am paired against the motion to strike out the enacting clause. This is an inadvertence, because I am against the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD and Journal may be corrected to show that I was opposed to H. R. 314, and therefore in favor of the motion to strike out the enacting clause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the RECORD and the Journal will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN HARLEY BURKE

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I have a sad duty to perform, one which I regret occasion requires. It is to announce the passing of a former able Member of this House on May 14, 1951, the late Honorable John Harley Burke, who also resided in my home city of Long Beach during most of his lifetime and represented for one term in this House the same congressional district I now represent, the Eighteenth District of California.

John Harley Burke was born in Exelsior, Wis., June 2, 1894, and moved to Long Beach in 1909. He and I attended the same high school at Long Beach. He attended the University of Santa Clara,

Calif., and the law department of the University of Southern California at Los Angeles, with a splendid record. He was admitted to the bar of the State of California in 1917 and commenced promptly law practice in Long Beach, Calif., and established a large law practice.

During the First World War, he served as a private in the Twelfth Training Battery Field Artillery, Camp Taylor, Ky., in 1918.

After he returned to Long Beach from one term in Congress—the Seventy-third session, March 4, 1933, to January 3, 1935—he engaged in the oil business as an independent producer. He was not a candidate for reelection to Congress. He was a life member of the Elks and a member of the American Legion.

I personally knew him from the year 1909. He was recognized as a very able, kindly, generous friend of a large circle of loyal friends. I know his wife and children personally; they are fine folks. She is a lovely and loyal wife. His children are all adults. I am sure that the House joins with me in expressing understanding sympathy to his family and his loved ones. His membership in this Congress was on the Democratic side of the political aisle. I shall always recall with pleasure my teaming up with him on a speaking team for the support of the Liberty bonds during the First World War. He was a very able and eloquent speaker in support of his position in public debate or in the courtroom. I appreciate your joining with me in extending sympathy to his family at Long Beach.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DOWN PAYMENT ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, from reports I am receiving back home, new and used automobiles are piling up in warehouses and showrooms to the sorrow of the American public who would like to buy them but cannot.

There are plenty of willing purchasers but they just cannot save the necessary one-third down payment.

(e) Millions of Soviet women groan beneath the yoke of forced heavy labor duties which are imposed upon them like cattle.

(f) The workers of the Soviet Union, far from being the proletarian beneficiaries, have strained beneath the heavy bondage of Soviet orders which completely govern their miserable wages, horrible hours, and impossible working conditions. Labor's so-called trade-unions are a travesty.

(g) The dissatisfied peasantry, which was once enticed to support Lenin on the theory that he would give them land, remembers the brutal slaughter of their millions during the 1920's, and has resisted the farm collectivization movement ever since its beginnings.

(h) The most grieved group of all are the untold numbers who are trapped in Soviet forced-labor camps, working under conditions as barbarous as the evil mind of men can devise, working until they drop from sheer starvation and exhaustion.

The whole Soviet structure from top to bottom is in effect enmeshed in a sickening pattern of mutual hatreds, deep-seated antagonisms for power and all of the other fatal features of a dictatorship.

So I urge that our American information program, instead of being a powder-puff affair should hit and hit hard in boldly exploiting these grievances of every single one of these groups. By intelligence and imagination, we can separate the masses of Russia from the relative handful which controls their destinies. We can appeal to each group in the Soviet population in terms that it will best understand, based on its own self-interests. We can appeal in terms of our deep appreciation of the finest in Russia's cultural, scientific, and other history.

This does not mean that our task will be easy. On the contrary, it will be difficult. It will take an immense understanding on our part; it will take the most careful and logical analysis of the whole nature of Soviet society, of Russian events in centuries gone by, of the Russian character. But we can fan the flames of tension until they burn in white heat throughout Russia.

The American people should not, however, expect a revolution in that ironclad-controlled regime. We have learned that modern armies, however small they are, can usually control massed millions of cowed and unarmed people.

Every bit of disturbance and antagonism, however, that we can fan is that much to the good. We can create so much trouble for Russia in her own backyard that she will shrink back from engaging in foreign aggression, for fear of collapse on the home front.

In addition, of course, we can and should continue our appeals to the enslaved foreign satellite peoples who hungrily yearn for their independence.

I repeat in conclusion, the people of Russia and the puppet states can be America's greatest allies. Why? Because the common people, like ourselves, want naught but peace and freedom. They have no quarrel with us; we have no quarrel with them. Our only difficulties arise in connection with the power-drunk men who enslave them.

ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGNING OF DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WHERRY. Yesterday, in behalf of the two Senators from the State of Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN and Mr. DUFF] I took up with the majority leader the question of consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 51, providing for United States participation in the celebration at Philadelphia, Pa., of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. I now ask unanimous consent—

and I wish the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] would give heed to my request—for the present consideration of the joint resolution. I am certain it will take very little, if any, time to consider the joint resolution. If it should develop that its consideration will require any considerable amount of time, I shall withdraw my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) providing for the United States participation in the celebration at Philadelphia, Pa., of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 14, after the name "Philadelphia" to insert "if those officials desire to recommend any such persons"; on page 3, line 6, after the word "universities", to strike out "and colleges" and insert "colleges, patriotic organizations and groups"; on page 4, line 3, after the word "section.", to insert "No person employed by the commission under the authority of section 3 of this resolution shall continue to receive any salary, wage, or remuneration of any kind by virtue of this resolution after the date on which the commission ceases to exist."; in line 8, after the word "appoint", to strike out the comma and "without regard to the civil service laws, such employees as are necessary to the performance of its functions," and insert "not more than two employees in one year"; and on page 5, after line 5, to strike out:

SEC. 5. The Postmaster General shall issue a special stamp for the commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence. Such stamp shall be issued in such denomination and design, and for such period beginning July 4, 1951, as the Postmaster General may determine to be appropriate.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That (a) there is hereby created a commission to be composed of 12 members, as follows: Two officers of the executive branch of the Federal Government to be appointed by the President of the United States; two Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate; two Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House; and six persons who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government to be appointed by the President of the United States, three upon recommendation of the Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and three upon recommendation of the mayor of the city of Philadelphia if those officials desire to recommend any such persons. Any vacancy in the membership of such commission shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(b) The commissioners shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the function of the commission, in cooperation with the government of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the government of the city of Philadelphia, (1) to prepare a plan for appropriate ceremonies at Philadelphia, Pa., on July 4, 1951, to observe and celebrate the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and (2) to execute such plan.

(b) In performing the functions set forth in subsection (a) of this section, the commission may—

(1) prepare, print, and distribute to public libraries, public schools, universities, colleges, patriotic organizations, and groups material containing such historical data as the commission may deem desirable to acquaint the public with the nature and significance of the celebration;

(2) if the commission deems it advisable, invite the participation of other nations in the celebration, and arrange for such participation with the governments of such nations;

(3) accept contributions of money and material for expenditure for use in the various activities of the commission;

(4) do all other things it deems necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

(c) The commission shall submit to the Congress, on or before March 1, 1952, a report of its activities, together with a detailed statement of the manner of expenditures of any funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in section 3 (b).

(d) The commission shall cease to exist 30 days after it submits the report required by subsection (c) of this section. No person employed by the commission under the authority of section 3 of this resolution shall continue to receive any salary, wage, or remuneration of any kind by virtue of this resolution after the date on which the commission ceases to exist.

SEC. 3. (a) The commission may appoint not more than two employees in 1 year and may fix the compensation of such employees without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The commission may make such expenditures as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution, including expenditures for printing and binding and expenditures for necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of commissioners and of employees of the commission in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949. All expenditures of the commission shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman of the commission.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the commission such sums, not to exceed \$100,000 in the aggregate, as may be necessary for the performance of its functions.

SEC. 4. Upon the request of the commission, the heads of the various Federal agencies (including the Library of Congress) may collect, prepare, and lend documents, articles, and other exhibits which, in their judgment, will serve to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Pennsylvania, I offer an amendment to the joint resolution, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, lines 22 and 23, it is proposed to strike out "and the government of the city of Philadelphia" and in lieu thereof insert a comma and the following: "the government of the city of Philadelphia, and the Commission for the Commemoration of the One Hundredth and Seventy-fifth

Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment. The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 51) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration of Independence will occur on July 4, 1951; and

Whereas it is desirable to accord suitable recognition of the value of the precepts of the Declaration in sustaining the Government of the United States as a strong bulwark against totalitarianism; and

Whereas fitting ceremonies to commemorate this anniversary are in process of preparation, such ceremonies to be held in the city of Philadelphia during the week of July 1 to July 7, 1951: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and also the majority leader [Mr. McFARLAND] for helping to expedite consideration of the joint resolution. Time is of the essence in its passage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska might include the Chair in his expression of thanks.

Mr. WHERRY. I would certainly like to underscore my expression of thanks to the Chair if that could be done in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or if that cannot be done in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I should like to have it appear in bold type.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND MR. RICHARDSON OVER HIS RESIGNATION AS CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, yesterday morning the newspapers announced the resignation of Seth W. Richardson as Chairman and member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. He is one of the outstanding citizens of the United States. He formerly lived in North Dakota. I have secured from him the correspondence that passed between President Truman and himself at the time of his resignation, and I ask unanimous consent that the letter sent by Mr. Richardson to President Truman, under date of June 6, 1951, and the letter received by Mr. Richardson from President Truman on the same date, may be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 6, 1951.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I hereby present to you my resignation as Chairman and member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, to take effect June 30, 1951. To my surprise, disgust, and discomfiture, I have just been advised by my doctors that it is imperative that I be at once hospitalized for immediate, extensive, critical surgical attention which they advise will probably incapacitate me for several months.

The Board is presently carrying on a hearing of vital national importance, under great difficulties, and I feel that it would not be in the public, or my own, interest for me to remain indefinitely as an inactive member and Chairman under the physical situation which presently confronts me.

I keenly regret not having yet been afforded a proper, timely opportunity for suitable consideration for confirmation by the Senate, but regardless of the merits of this delay and my intense wish to meet the issue, my doctors will not permit me to defer my medical necessities longer.

I deeply appreciate the faith and esteem you have shown me, a lifelong, contentious Republican, in affording me opportunities to engage in important nonpartisan public services, free from any suggestion of political motives, and so intimately affecting the vital field of national loyalties.

I leave these tasks now with the feeling that in my performance of them I have accomplished the most worthy work I have ever done. I am deeply grateful to you for extending such an opportunity for public service, and I regret that the important matters of health to which I have referred, require me to end, at least for the present, any further public activities.

Respectfully yours,

SETH W. RICHARDSON,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 6, 1951.

Hon. SETH W. RICHARDSON,
Chairman, Subversive Activities Control Board, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RICHARDSON: It is with reluctance and heartfelt regret that I accept your resignation as Chairman and member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I do not want to let you go and it if were not for the most compelling reason of your health I would insist on your staying.

Ever since you returned to duty in the Government, on November 11, 1947, as Chairman of the Loyalty Review Board, you have been guarding our security against subversion and protecting our heritage of constitutional government.

You brought to the Federal loyalty program a balanced, mature judgment and a leadership which resulted in the rooting out, from our Government, of the guilty while always protecting the innocent. Your magnificent performance on the Loyalty Review Board prompted me last October to appoint you as Chairman and member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

I noted with a chuckle your description of yourself as "a lifelong, contentious Republican." The job to which I called you demanded integrity, discretion, sound judgment, and ability to view all problems, no matter how complex, with complete detachment and objectivity. Those qualities you possess in abundance. Best of all you "don't panic easy."

I wanted a man who, despite all pressures, no matter the source, whether from within or without, would guard the public interest—the national security—with singleness of purpose. In you I found the man who met the specifications above outlined.

I agree with you that as you leave these tasks you are justified in the feeling that in your performance of them you have accomplished the most worthy work you have ever done.

Since you are faced with an immediate decision regarding your health I cannot stand in the way of your meeting it. With deepest regret, therefore, I acquiesce in your wish and accept your resignation, effective at the close of business on June 30, next.

With every good wish,

Gratefully and sincerely,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that all amendments to the appropriation bill have been disposed of except one, which the clerk will state.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 41, after line 24, it is proposed to strike out:

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriations or authorizations contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

(a) to not to exceed 25 percent of all such vacancies.

(b) to positions filled from within the agency.

(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

(d) to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel, including orderlies, in the Public Health Service, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and Freedmen's Hospital.

(e) to employees in grades C. P. C. 1 and 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does that complete the committee amendments?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to amendment from the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McMahon
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Moody
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Hoey	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kefauver	Smathers
Connally	Kem	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lehman	Taft
Duff	Lodge	Thye
Dworshak	Long	Underwood
Eastland	Magnuson	Watkins
Eaton	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Maybank	Wherry
Ferguson	McCarthy	Wiley
Flanders	McClellan	Williams
Frear	McFarland	Young
George	McKellar	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from West

Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I move on page 2 to strike out lines 13 and 14 and to insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$1,000,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely move that on page 2 lines 12 and 13 be stricken from the bill, and that in lieu of the figure "\$1,400,000" there be inserted the figure "\$1,000,000."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2 it is proposed to strike out all of lines 12 and 13, and in lieu thereof insert the figure "\$1,000,000."

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the reason for my offering the amendment is that the employment figures for the Department of Labor show that at the beginning of 1949 there were altogether 3,537 employees in the Department. There was an increase of employees in the Department of 50 percent in 1949 and 16 percent during 1950. During 1951 the Department intends to increase the number of employees still further. I see no reason why we should not cut the figure back at this time. If we wish to reduce appropriations this is one way of getting underway in that direction. I believe the time has come for us to cut as much as we can, and I think such cuts should be made not only in the field service, but also in the office of the Secretary.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to go along with the Senator from Delaware in his amendment. I know he wishes to save money. But so does the subcommittee. In our figure we are \$25,823 below last year's appropriation. We are \$75,000 below the budget estimate for 1952. I repeat that the subcommittee certainly has tried to save some money. As between the House figures and the Senate figures, the bill as reported to the Senate is \$112,867,530 under the House

allowance. It is \$215,914,929 under the budget estimates. I consider that the committee went the limit in seeking to bring about a reduction, and I feel that no further cut in this particular item should be made. If a further cut were made it would interfere with the proper functions of Government. The report of the subcommittee was submitted unanimously by all members of the committee, representing both sides of the aisle. All departments, including the Department of Labor, were informed that unless they made cuts the committee would make them.

What is presented is the best the committee could in conscience do. We cannot go further in reducing appropriations and still carry on the functions of the Government. Of course, Mr. President, we could strike out the whole amount, but I should like to ask any fair-minded Member of this body who desires to have the Government carry on whether that would be proper. I hope the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish to say one further word. While what the Senator from New Mexico said is true, the fact remains that the appropriations carried in the bill are \$91,000,000 over and above 1951 appropriations. There is no reason why the appropriations cannot be cut this year. There is no reason why the departments cannot operate on as much money as they operated on during last year. In fact, they should be able to operate on a lower amount. The only way to force them to do so is to make the cuts on the floor of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to the amendment of the committee. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk my amendment B, and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, it is proposed to strike out lines 17 and 18, and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,575,000."

THE CHIPS ARE DOWN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we now proceed to the discussion of the first of our regular appropriation bills. The chips are down. In a month or so the Nation will know whether Congress is determined to eliminate waste in Government, sacrifice less-essential functions, balance the budget, and prevent inflation; or whether the Congress is reluctant to eliminate waste in Government, reluctant to eliminate less-neces-

sary functions; we will know if Congress will refuse to balance the budget, and force the Treasury to borrow from the banks, with an inflation of credit and a consequent increase in prices and suffering to the communities of the Nation. The decisions we have to make are important, and it is very desirable that the membership of the Senate approach them soberly and with a view to the over-all situation.

I should like to speak very briefly on the general budgetary situation which faces us.

According to the estimates of the administration, as submitted in January, it was requested that Congress appropriate approximately \$71,500,000,000; \$41,000,000,000 of that sum was more or less directly for war purposes within this country. Approximately \$10,000,000,000 more was primarily for military aid to our allies and for atomic energy, making a total of approximately \$51,000,000,000, leaving \$20,000,000,000 for other purposes. Of this \$20,000,000,000, \$10,000,000,000 were for interest on the public debt and the care of the veterans, leaving \$10,000,000,000 for nonmilitary purposes and not for expenditures connected with past wars, but rather for purely civil functions.

The Bureau of the Budget and the President estimated at that time that the projected receipts for 1951-52, under the present scale of taxes, would amount to approximately \$55,000,000,000, leaving an estimated deficit, as of January, of about \$16,500,000,000.

WE FACE A DEFICIT OF \$12,500,000,000

Since then, two things have happened: Apparently the request for military aid abroad is somewhat in excess of what had been contemplated in January, by approximately \$1,000,000,000, indicating that under the present plans total expenditures will go up to \$72,500,000,000. It is also true that with the increased scale of prices and the increase in the national income, the present taxes will yield more than \$55,000,000,000, possibly as much as \$60,000,000,000, and the deficit which we therefore face will be approximately \$12,500,000,000. But all this assumes—and this is a very significant qualification—that governmental expenditures do not further increase above the \$72,500,000,000 level now contemplated. They may increase both because of inflation, rising prices of the goods which the Government must buy, and also from salary increases necessary to protect, in part, governmental employees against the impairment of real income which they have already suffered.

I understand that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is at least on the point of recommending a salary increase of approximately 8 percent for governmental employees. If that is done, the total expenditures will increase by perhaps three-quarters of a billion dollars. So unless we bring about economies, we can look forward in the coming year to expenditures which will be not less than \$72,500,000,000, and in all probability will be more. Meanwhile we must realize that we shall not have

more than \$60,000,000,000 of revenue in sight.

If we have a deficit of \$12,500,000,000, it will be very serious indeed for the country. It will not be possible for us to raise this amount of money from the savings of individuals and corporations. The situation will be especially difficult if people fear that their principal is going to be depreciated by a rise in the price level.

If the deficit is of this proportion, the Government will be forced to borrow from the banks. The banks will make their loans in the form of creating credit accounts against which the Government will draw. There will, therefore, be an increase in the quantity of money and credit in relation to the supply of goods. The inevitable result will be an appreciable rise in prices, or what we popularly term inflation. This will be of very serious consequence indeed to the American people.

WE MUST BALANCE THE BUDGET

Therefore, Mr. President, it is highly essential that we balance the budget.

The House Committee on Ways and Means is considering a tax bill which it is understood will call for approximately \$7,000,000,000 in additional revenue. That, I believe, is a very necessary step; but even that will leave us with a deficit of at least \$5,500,000,000; and a deficit of that amount will be a very severe danger to the people of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, if we are to be serious in our attempt to balance the budget, we shall have to use the paring knife on the appropriations which now are before us.

It seems to me that we should make every effort to reduce the budget by \$5,000,000,000. I had hoped that possibly a \$4,000,000,000 cut might be sufficient, but it now seems to me that at a minimum we should cut the budget by \$5,000,000,000. In the nature of events, this will mean that we shall have to make some cuts in military appropriations, and some cuts, in my opinion, in expenditures for foreign aid. This will be necessary because the entire burden of a \$5,000,000,000 cut cannot be borne by the \$10,000,000,000 of civilian expenditures for purposes other than aid to veterans and interest on the public debt. We shall have to practice the most rigid economy in connection with those appropriations, and we shall also have to make very rigid cuts in the appropriations for the civil functions of government, which tentatively total about \$10,000,000,000.

THE BILL BEFORE US

We now have before us a bill providing appropriations of approximately \$2,500,000,000. As all of us know, the vast proportion of these sums cannot be decreased by the Government; they are statutory payments for unemployment, for old-age assistance to the needy, and other payments under statutory provisions already made by law, which either the State governments or the Federal Government will be compelled to fulfill. So we should not delude ourselves with the idea that any large

proportion of the \$2,500,000,000 of appropriations contained in the pending bill can be cut by Congress at this time. That means that the small economies, the economies we can make, are the ones toward which we should bend our efforts; and we should not reject them merely because they are small in amount or because we seem to be niggardly by acting to reduce them.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to the claim of the Appropriations Committee that it has been able to effect reductions of approximately \$113,000,000 below the appropriations contained in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives. I wish to commend the Appropriations Committee for the careful and patient work it has done, and I desire to praise the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for the energy he has applied. But I should like to point out, if I may, that savings of \$150,000,000, which the committee claims in the latter part of its report, on pages 13 and 14, are really bookkeeping savings, rather than real savings.

COMMITTEE SAVINGS ARE NOT REAL

For example, the committee claims a reduction of \$50,500,000 in appropriations to the Railway Retirement Board. As the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] developed yesterday in his questioning, this is not a real saving. The funds devoted to the payment of railway retirement pensions and benefits are derived from a special tax of 12 percent levied equally upon the railroads and the railroad employees. They are not derived from the general funds. All the money collected from railways by this special tax is turned over to the Railway Retirement Board for the payment of benefits and for the accumulation of a reserve for future benefits. The liability of the Board is limited to the funds which have thus been accumulated.

What has happened in the past is that by bookkeeping transfers the Board has been credited with a higher payroll than the railways have in practice paid out, with the result that more sums have been turned over to the Board than those to which it was statutorily entitled. Sooner or later this overpayment of \$50,500,000 would have been corrected. It so happens that it is corrected this year, and the committee shows a bookkeeping gain by picking it up at this time. But it is in no sense a real saving, it is in no sense an economy. It is merely showing in this year a saving which would have been credited in future years. The money probably would not be spent, even if the cut had not been made. So this is a paper saving only.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Nevertheless, if the saving could have been made in future years, and we made it this year, it certainly was a saving this year, was it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to commend the chairman in that he noted that there had been overpayments in previous years.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was known to others, however, and sooner or later it would have been picked up.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is no question, it could have been done years hence.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It could have been done 15 years hence. But the committee wanted to save the \$50,000,000 this year, and that is what it did.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Similarly the committee claims, on page 13, an economy of \$100,000,000 by reducing the appropriation to the Bureau of Public Assistance, for meeting the cost of old-age assistance, and aid to dependent children, to the blind, and to the permanently and totally disabled. These are amounts paid out by the States, of which the Federal Government meets approximately half, or, in the case of old-age assistance and assistance to children, slightly more than half. It is the State which determines the total number of persons who are to receive assistance, and the amounts which they are to receive. The Federal Government merely provides a fraction, originally approximately half, but, by amendments to the act, now more than half; and the amounts which the Federal Government pays out are dependent upon the amounts which the States spend. The Federal Government does not determine how much is spent. It merely provides a portion of the total cost, on the basis of State payments. So, unless we change the statute, we cannot change the amount to be spent. That is automatically determined by the States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from Illinois agree, however, that, had we allowed this \$100,000,000, which we deducted, together with from \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000 which the States had unobligated, they would have had an unobligated balance of \$200,000,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think what is more likely to happen is that the States, with the present number of needy aged persons, are very likely to come in for deficiency appropriations later in the year. What we may find, therefore, is that this apparent present economy will merely result in a request for greater appropriations later. I warn against believing that this \$100,000,000 has really been saved, because we cannot control the amounts which are distributed to the final parties in the field. These expenditures are automatic.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course we cannot; but I believe the Senator from Illinois has advocated heretofore the adoption of a method of this kind. If the States have from \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000 unobligated, of the moneys contributed, why should the Appropriations Committee give them \$100,000,000 more?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not objecting to the action of the Appropriations Committee in reducing the amounts allocated to the States by \$100,000,000. I am merely saying that we should not regard this as a definitive economy. We are likely to find that it is merely a book-

keeping gain, which is likely to disappear later in the year as the deficiency appropriations come in. That is all I am saying.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois whether it is not a fact that that is our difficulty with practically all the cuts in appropriations. My experience on the committee has been that when we make a cut there shortly follows a deficiency bill in which funds are provided to cover the very cut which had been made. We must watch that. If we were to make this cut now, there would be this advantage, namely, that it would be necessary for the agency to come before the committee again to justify the renewed request. That would help somewhat in our effort to pare the appropriations.

However, I am in agreement with what the distinguished Senator said, that it is impossible for us to take the position here that we are effecting a saving, if it is known that, in the final analysis, a deficiency request may again contain this item of appropriation. There is something to the argument. On the other hand, I submit to the distinguished Senator that our job is to cut the appropriation where we can, and then, if the department or agency comes back for a deficiency, it must be justified all over again.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Nebraska that he is correct. Frequently bureaus and departments come before the Senate committee with requests for deficiency appropriations to make good the cuts which they have suffered in the main appropriation bill; but they are at least appointees of the Federal Government, and, therefore, somewhat under our control. In this particular case, however, what we are dealing with is expenditures by States, over whom we have almost no control. All we do is to meet a fraction of the amounts which they distribute; and if the 48 States follow a policy of determining that there are a given number of aged people and provide benefits for them, we are contractually obligated by statute to meet our portion, and we cannot then object that the States have proceeded in violation of the original budget.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I appreciate the diligence of the Senator from Illinois in trying to bring about cuts. The point I am trying to make is, it appears to me that the position which is now taken is rather inconsistent with the idea of cutting, because, surely, the Senator will agree that, if the States, in keeping with the formula which he has enunciated, have to do certain things, and if they have from \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000 unobligated, there is a saving of \$100,000,000, if they request \$100,000,000 more, and we do not give it to them?

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we do not give it to them; but the Federal Government

is obligated to meet its fraction of the amount distributed in assistance to aged, to dependent children, to the blind, and to the permanently and totally disabled. The determination of the number of persons who are to receive such aid and the amounts they are to receive is not in the hands of the Federal Government but is in the hands of the States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the very idea which the committee had in mind when it deducted \$100,000,000, because, to carry out their obligations and to perform their duties and functions, the States have from \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000, which is unobligated. That indicated that evidently the case load was not so large as had been suggested to us in the consideration of last year's appropriation bill. So, this year, we said: "No; you have from \$80,000,000 to \$100,000,000 unobligated, and yet you ask us for \$100,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not wish to labor the point. I merely wish to say that the Federal appropriation for this item is automatic. It does not matter very much what the Appropriations Committee does; the main issue is what is done in the States. The decisions will be made primarily by the States, and this \$100,000,000 saving my disappear. We cannot count on it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator once more?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So that the Senator from Illinois may understand exactly what the committee had in mind, let me call his attention to page 8 of the report, where it is stated:

The committee recommends \$1,150,000,000, a reduction of \$100,000,000 under the House allowance, \$150,000,000 under the budget estimate, and \$130,000,000 under the 1951 appropriation.

Why was that done? It was done because the committee found that it was conservatively estimated that there would be unobligated \$80,000,000 of the current year's appropriation. The expenditure of the money is based upon employment rolls. Under the situation at the moment, because of national-defense activities and because of the fact that factories are employing as many persons as they can possibly get, we figured the States could save even more than we indicated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Again, Mr. President, I do not want to labor the point. I merely say that the country has been fortunate in that there has been a decline in the need for old-age assistance, largely because of an improvement in the economic situation. But we should not depend upon these more or less fortuitous occurrences. There is no substitute for the sturdy virtues of self-denial and rigorous self-discipline.

If we examine the committee report, it will be found that the economies consist almost entirely of these two items. They constitute \$150,500,000 of the \$154,000,000 cut. On the other hand, I should like to point out that on page 12 there are shown increases over the House bill of \$41,100,000. Twenty millions of dollars of this amount is an increase in the amount for hospital construction;

\$12,000,000, an increase in payments to school districts for maintenance and operation, not construction; \$1,800,000 in increased payments for so-called distributive education, or training of school children and other persons in selling. There is an increase of \$3,000,000 in grants to States for maternal and child welfare, and so forth.

I should like to point out that if we find that the needs in the States are greater than the committee at the present time anticipates, we may find that expenditures at the end of the year will be as great as those contemplated by the House.

COMMITTEE ECONOMIES NOT SUFFICIENT

About the only cuts which the committee made, aside from the two items which I have mentioned, have been cuts of 5 percent in administrative expenses of the Labor Department, the Federal Security Agency, and the various boards which are included in the bill. The cut of 5 percent was in lieu of the so-called Jensen amendment passed by the House and rejected by the committee, which, with the exception of grades 1 and 2, provided that only one vacancy out of every four should be filled during the coming year. It may well be that the Jensen amendment cut too deeply. It may be that the provision that only one vacancy out of four should be filled would have been too stringent.

But certainly some reduction in total personnel is required. If we were to adopt a modified Jensen provision of one vacancy out of every two being filled, I think the total saving effected would be somewhat more than 5 percent, according to computations which I have made. I believe the total savings would be approximately 8 percent, on the basis of a turn-over of approximately 27 or 28 percent for the Government.

So I think it will be found that, in effect, the Senate committee did not introduce any real economies at all as compared with the House bill. On the whole, there has been some slackening in the economies proposed by the House.

SELECTIVE CUTS THE BEST METHOD

It is in the light of that fact, and in the light of the further fact that the Government of the United States is really in a desperate financial situation and there is necessity for reducing total appropriations by somewhere around \$5,000,000,000, that I am going to propose my series of approximately 25 amendments, the first of which is now before the Senate.

What I am trying to do, I may say, is to introduce a system of selective cuts. I know it would be easy to pass over the individual items of the bill and then, at the end of the bill, to submit a general amendment providing that personnel should be reduced by one-half, or providing for a general cut of 10 percent. I do not quarrel with those who would take that course. I merely say that I do not think it is the best course, because even within a department or an agency there may be bureaus of unequal merit. There may be two bureaus existing side by side, one practicing rigid

economy and the other being relatively wasteful and spendthrift. A wholesale cut of 10 percent falls, like the rain of God, upon the just and the unjust alike. It is a sort of meat-ax operation, instead of employing the surgeon's scalpel. My idea is to introduce the use of the surgeon's scalpel, and try to cut away the waste and less-essential tissue where I think it exists, but to save those portions of the agencies which, on the whole, have been doing a relatively good job.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I agree with the Senator that the pruning knife should be used on waste tissue wherever it exists, but inasmuch as my good friend from Illinois has been discussing an increase of \$20,000,000 which the committee recommended for hospital construction, I would say to him, in view of the fact that the authorization is \$150,000,000 for this noble purpose, that I hope he does not call hospital construction throughout the country a waste.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad the Senator raised the point, because if he had waited for a minute, I would have passed on to that very issue. In past years, I have thought we could balance the budget merely by the elimination of waste. This year I think it will not be possible to balance the budget merely by the elimination of waste, and that, painful as it is, it is going to be necessary to reduce some of the functions which in better times we thought we could carry. In other words, we must drop overboard some of the less essential programs and not carry out essential programs as fully as we otherwise would have desired.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should prefer not to yield at this time. The surgeon's knife will have to be applied to the less-necessary departments and the less-necessary functions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Would the Senator be willing to apply the same test to funds that might be expended elsewhere, outside of the country, for the same purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I am going to be very rigid on that point. I assure Senators they are not going to put me over the barrel on that issue.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I cannot resist yielding to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. What is the total amount of the cut the Senator from Illinois is proposing?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The total amount of the cut on these items will approximate \$50,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. About \$50,000,000?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. That may seem to be a small sum to discuss in the Senate Chamber, but I think it is worthy of a few moments of attention. If I may be permitted to proceed, I should like to answer.

Mr. AIKEN. Go ahead.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not want to shut off the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Perhaps if the Senator from Vermont changed the location of his seat he might get recognition from the Senator from Illinois more easily.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Did I shut off the Senator? I do not want to do that.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not want to delay the Senator from Illinois. I thought he had about concluded this discussion, and that was why I asked the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The reduction comes to about \$50,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. That answers my question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is about \$50,000,000. I say say, Mr. President, that it is extremely painful to me to use the knife on the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency. It so happens that as a private citizen I campaigned in the 1920's and the 1930's for old-age pensions, for unemployment insurance, for minimum-wage laws, and for the 40-hour week. As one of many thousands of citizens, I played a modest part in getting some of these statutes on the books of various States of the Union and also enacted by the Federal Government. I take a modest pride in whatever share I may have had as a citizen in these activities. I believe in these measures. I think they have been great steps forwards. I hope we hold onto these programs. I should resist to the death any move to abolish them. But if one proposes economies on things which are not close to his heart, he must also be willing to propose economies on things which are close to his heart.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely wish to inquire of the Senator whether he intends to offer an amendment reducing the appropriation for hospital construction. Possibly I would have been familiar with what the Senator is after if I had studied the various amendments carefully.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, I will offer an amendment reducing the appropriation for hospital construction by \$20,000,000.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I make an observation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President—

Mr. LEHMAN. I am very sorry indeed—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I shall have to ask for the regular order. I do not desire to shut off my distinguished friend from New York, but I think we should go along with the work of the Senate. The Senator from Illinois has the floor. I do not object to him speaking as long as he desires, but if one Senator begins farming out the time to various other Senators to make observations on points raised, that will occupy the time all afternoon, and we will get nowhere with the appropriation bill. I hope the Senator from New York will not feel that I am in any way shutting him off.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I withdraw my request to make an observation, and ask the Senator to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I need not assure the Senator from Illinois of my high regard and admiration for him, and also of my satisfaction over the fact that he is approaching the matter with a surgeon's knife rather than a meat ax. However, I should like to ask him if he does not think hospital construction is about as important as anything for which we could possibly appropriate money? In importance it seems to me to come immediately after appropriations for direct aid to our defense effort. In my opinion it is very closely allied with our defense effort.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say, in answer to the Senator from New York, that it pains me greatly to propose the amendment, but I am proposing that we return to the House figure, which is \$175,000,000. Necessary and desirable as hospital construction is, the defense of the Nation and our economic strength are even more important. Therefore, reluctantly, but no less vigorously, I intend to press my amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator says the defense of the Nation is absolutely necessary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the first essential; yes.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, we on this side of the aisle cannot hear the Senator from New Mexico. Will he speak a little louder?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, Mr. President, I will speak louder. The Senator from Illinois has stated that the defense of the Nation is the first essential. We agree with him. But does not the Senator from Illinois think that if we have to defend the Nation according to the ideas and the ideals which I know animate my good friend from Illinois, it is just as necessary to provide hospitals for those who defend the Nation as it is to provide the guns or possibly the scrap iron which might produce the necessity for the hospitals?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that I do not want to be drawn too closely into a discussion of the hospital amendment at this time, because it is not yet before the Senate. What I am proposing at the moment is a cut in the expenditures for the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor, and I should like to have the concrete discussion on hospitals reserved until the time when the amendment dealing with them is proposed.

Mr. President, not only are these projects very close to my heart, but it so happens that I think I have more personal and political friends in the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency than in any of the other agencies of government. Some of the officials in the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency are lifetime friends of mine, men for whom I have a very high personal regard, men whose hearts beat in some unison with mine on many issues of the day. In one or two cases they have been unfortunate enough to have been students of mine.

I had hoped that some bill other than the Labor and Federal Security bill would be the first to be presented to the Sen-

ate. I had hoped that I might at least vote for economies on other measures before I felt compelled to apply the knife to the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency. So I feel somewhat embarrassed about it. But if we cut only on things with which we are not intimately concerned, and resist cuts on those matters in which we are concerned, we will never achieve economy. We must use the knife on the things which are close to our hearts, both in order to gain support from others and to win the support of the country. We will only break the lethargy in reducing appropriations by being rigorous in cutting things in which we are vitally interested, as well as those in which we are not.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; and I apologize to the Senator from Vermont if I seemed abrupt a few moments ago.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand perfectly. Am I correct in understanding that the amendments offered by the Senator from Illinois remove the limit on each appropriation which can be spent for personal services? As I read them they appear to do that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are cuts in total appropriation items; yes.

Mr. AIKEN. They are cuts in the total appropriation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it be left up to each branch of each department as to the part to be spent for personal services?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, although most items are for salaries and expenses.

Mr. AIKEN. If there is no limitation in that respect, I was wondering whether that would effect the purpose of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would still be in order to use some form of modified Jensen amendment at the end which would effect a general reduction in personnel.

Mr. President, I should like to make one disclaimer before I come to the question of the Solicitor's office. I know it seems very ungracious for a Senator who is not a member of the Appropriations Committee to rise on the floor of the Senate and propose a series of detailed cuts. In the first place, it apparently puts him in the position of assuming an importance which he does not possess. It is perfectly true that the information as to these matters possessed by a Senator not a member of the Appropriations Committee is not so perfect as is the information of those who are members, and who have heard the justifications advanced, and so on. I realize that many of my colleagues, charitable as they are, are probably wondering why I am doing it. I hope I am doing it with a desire to save money and serve the best interests of the country. I believe that is why I am active in this work.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator that I have found the answer to the question which I asked a few minutes ago. The first two amendments proposed by the Senator from Illinois apparently strike out the limitation on the amount that can be spent for personal services.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct; but they reduce the total amounts for salaries and expenses.

Mr. AIKEN. The other amendments do not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I think that information ought to go into the RECORD.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Nevertheless, unless the Senate is to become a mere rubber stamp, it should have some right to review the activities of its committees. If we are to accept implicitly everything presented to us by committees, we may as well cease any sessions of the Senate as such, and merely ratify decisions taken by committees.

So I hope that members of the Appropriations Committee will not take it amiss, will not think that I am indulging in a self-importance which I assure Senators I do not feel I possess, when I make these proposals. I am making the proposals only because we need to cut far more deeply than the committee has done. We need to cut far more deeply in the interests of national solvency, to prevent inflation, and to prevent the public debt from multiplying.

I hope that this over-lengthy explanation, which was longer than I originally intended, will pave the way for a discussion of the concrete amendments. What I am proposing, at the moment, is that instead of appropriating approximately \$1,670,000 for the Solicitor's office, we appropriate \$1,575,000, or a reduction of approximately \$95,000. In brief, this is a cut of 8½ percent below the budget estimate.

Mr. President, I submit that on the whole, the legal staffs of the Government are swollen and inflated. If there is one commodity of which the Government has a surplus, it is lawyers. Virtually every agency has a large number of lawyers, a large percentage of whom are not needed. I know that statement comes hard in a body the majority of whose Members are lawyers; but the function of these lawyers generally is to tell the head of the agency that he can legally do what he wants to do, that there is legal ground for proceeding in the way he wants to proceed. If the head of the agency wants to deny jurisdiction and does not wish to take up a subject, lo and behold, the lawyer in his agency will produce an opinion showing that it is either unconstitutional or illegal to take the matter up. If the head of the agency wants to assume jurisdiction, an opinion will be produced showing that there is a sound constitutional or legal basis for his doing so.

We have progressed to the point where it is not the Congress which really makes the laws of the country. It is the heads of the agencies who interpret the laws and get from their paid attorneys opinions which in some cases are in viola-

tion of the statute, and in many cases do not carry out the intent of the statute.

So while I have a very firm feeling for lawyers as a class, and especially for those lawyers who are Members of this body, nevertheless, I think that this is an appropriation which can with profit be reduced. Without wishing to be sadistic toward these attorneys, many of them may return to more profitable employment in private industry or in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. President, I hope, therefore, that the pending amendment will be agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE OF HORSES OR DOGS FOR RACING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of horses or dogs for the purpose of participating in races where facilities for betting on such races are available, and/or where money prizes are awarded to the winners and others for participating therein. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD in full at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1626) to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of horses or dogs for the purpose of participating in races where facilities for betting on such races are available and/or where money prizes are awarded to the winners and others participating therein, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the purpose of this act is to assist the various States, Territories, and possessions of the United States and the District of Columbia in the enforcement of their laws pertaining to gambling, bookmaking, and like offenses and to aid in the suppression of organized-gambling activities.

(b) "Transportation in interstate commerce" means transportation directly or indirectly from any place in any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia to any place in any other State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or the District of Columbia.

(c) "Transportation in foreign commerce" means transportation directly or indirectly from or to any place in the United States to or from a foreign country or ship at sea or in the air.

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person or persons to ship, carry, transport, or deliver by any means whatsoever in interstate or foreign commerce, or cause to be shipped, carried, transported, or delivered by any means whatsoever in interstate or foreign commerce, horses or dogs for the purpose of participating in races where facilities for betting on such races are available and/or where money prizes are awarded to the winners and others participating therein.

(b) Nothing in this act shall be construed to prevent transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of horses or dogs for the purpose of participating in any events at which no facilities for betting are available or money prizes awarded, nor for any other purposes.

SEC. 3. Whoever knowingly ships, carries, transports, or delivers by any means whatsoever in interstate or foreign commerce,

or causes to be shipped, carried, transported, or delivered by any means whatsoever in interstate or foreign commerce, horses or dogs for the purpose of participating in races where facilities for betting on such races are available and/or where money prizes are awarded to the winners and others participating therein, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both, and each transportation shall constitute a separate offense.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during the past year and a half I have observed with interest the various suggestions that have been made both in Congress and in the newspapers throughout the country both with respect to the legalization of gambling and also the suggested steps to completely wipe out gambling. I have also noted with interest Senate 3353 which was introduced in the last Congress and passed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which would prohibit the publication of information with respect to horse and dog races. In the present session I have observed Senate 1563 and 1564 which approach the problem from a different aspect but also are directed to the end of endeavoring to curtail illegal gambling. At this time I feel it is not necessary to comment on any of these bills as I have, after considerable study, concluded that there is only one satisfactory solution to the question of stopping illegal gambling, insofar as such gambling takes place on horse or dog racing. I believe a most succinct statement of the solution of the problem is contained in an editorial which appeared in the Hartford Courant on May 3, 1951. I should like to read that editorial at this time:

THE KEFAUVER REPORT

The long-awaited Kefauver report on crime in the United States is really a rather threadbare tale. The fact that horse racing, bookmaking, transmission of race-track news, politics, and racketeering are all tied up together will be news to nobody but hermits and inmates of institutions for the feeble-minded. Race track wire services, furnishing quick information on the horses, are plums over which gangs have fought battles and men have died. Muscle men have for years maintained monopolies for their gangland bosses.

One of the prime recommendations of the Kefauver group is passage of legislation regulating such services. All persons having to do with the transmission of this information would be licensed. And no company dealing exclusively in this kind of information would be licensed. By this device, it is hoped to get around the objection that banning news on the nags would be interfering with freedom of the press. The Federal Communications Commission has already made it clear that it has no desire to act as policemen on this beat.

Admirable as the Kefauver report may be, and well-intended as Senator KEFAUVER, little that is new came out of the hearings. Beyond the virtue of focusing public attention on gangsters and their political friends, it was little more than television hippodrome. So, too, the recommendations made by the Committee now with reference to licensing wire services, while good, are not good enough.

The fundamental trouble with the Kefauver Committee, and with even the most pious of its members, is that not one of them is willing to look to the fundamental root of this crime picture. The wire services

that furnish information to the bookies are merely the effluvia. Without the race tracks and the horses there would be no such service.

The Kefauver committee studiously avoids looking this situation in the eye. It backs away from it and produces this mouse-like recommendation, even though the mountain quivered deliciously for days on television. To the objection that horse racing is a purely intra-State racket, it can be said that the Federal Government has before this legislated out of existence situations that were even more localized. By the simple device of banning prison made products from interstate commerce the Federal Government shut up some forty State-operated prison workshops.

If Senator KEFAUVER and his colleagues wish to be taken seriously, let them recommend that the transportation of race horses in interstate commerce be banned. Without such interstate shipment a great many tracks would wither away. If the same interstate policing power were also exerted against the shipment of racing information, hay or grain for race horses, the going for the bookies could be made really difficult.

This recommendation is made, of course, with the full knowledge that neither Senator KEFAUVER nor even the pious Senator TOBEY will go along with it. Imagine how popular Mr. KEFAUVER would be down in the bluegrass section if he tried a knockout blow at the sport of touts? And Mr. TOBEY's constituents, or a good number of them, also like to put a few bucks on the nose at the New Hampshire race-track establishment. Until there is official recognition that racing wire services are only a by-product of the tracks, and that prophylaxis should be directed at the real evil, the efforts of Senator KEFAUVER and his colleagues, while admirable, are not anything to get unduly excited about.

Somewhat to the same tenor is an article by Columnist Fred Othman, which appeared in the Washington Daily News last June 19, 1950, and which also analyzes this problem. He said:

NO HORSES, NO BETS

The Democratic gentleman from Milwaukee, Representative Andrew J. Biemiller, figures the only way to stop betting on horse races is to eliminate them.

There'd be no bookmakers, no betting syndicates and no shady racing news services, said he, if there were no races.

His fellow lawgivers were aghast. Mostly they like these contests between the noble nags. And mostly they lay down a perfectly legal wager when they visit the track. Yet they're knocking themselves out, trying to rid the Nation of betting on the hosses when the gambling takes place away from the tracks. I guess I'm dumb. I can't see the difference between putting \$2 on the nose of a filly you can see in front of you and one in a race a couple of hundred miles away.

What I mean is that I rolled out to Maryland the other evening for the final session of the harness races at Rosecroft. The scenery was pretty and so were the horses, while the breeze was soft, and the food in the clubhouse superb.

The jockeys in these races mostly were old geezers in striped satin jackets and gold-rimmed eyeglasses; one sported a small white goatee. They rode in two-wheeled carts called sulkies and each had a superb view of his own horse's tail.

The clubhouse was jammed with sportsmen like myself. At the next table sat a United States Senator, who stands foursquare against bookmaking, which he considers a crime. He ordered up a sirloin steak, which cost him \$3.50 without trimmings. Between races he put down his bets;

during their running he was more concerned with his dinner than in the contests under the floodlights down below.

So were a lot of other people.

They got a few quick glimpses of the horses, but what fascinated them was the voice on the loud speaker announcing which nag had won. They stopped eating then. And I claim they could have got the same results via telephone, except, of course, that this would have been illegal.

After finishing their dinners a number of the patrons ambled downstairs, took a gander at the handsome horseflesh and the elderly parties on the sulkies, then repaired to the bar, where refreshments were available at reasonable prices.

This is known in horse-racing circles as improving the breed. I'm not kicking about that, either, because I am a broad-minded fellow.

Only I don't quite see the justice of the lawgivers wanting to put into the clink the little guy down the street who'll take a small wager and thereby save me the trouble of going out to the track.

He certainly works harder for his money than the gent on track's microphone. This mellow-voiced individual kept urging the customers to make their investments at the ticket windows while there was still time. The little guy who makes book comes around personally to get the money.

I guess I'll have to go along with Representative Biemiller. I'd hate to see it happen, but if we're going to eliminate betting on horses, we'll also have to eliminate the races.

Mr. President, in the bill I am now introducing, I propose to prohibit the transportation in interstate or foreign commerce of horses or dogs for the purpose of participating in races where facilities for betting on such races are available and/or where money prizes are awarded to the winners and others participating therein. This bill in no wise would prohibit the transportation of horses or dogs for any other purpose, such as breeding, show or shows, work, hunting, pleasure riding, and so forth. Under the bill, as proposed, horse or dog racing could continue in any State where such racing has been legalized as a medium for betting at specified gambling enclosures authorized by the State. However, the enactment of the bill would prohibit the transportation of horses and dogs from the northern tracks to the southern tracks, from the eastern tracks to the western tracks, and vice versa. As we all know, there is no horse or dog racing at the northern tracks during the winter season. At that time the horses or dogs are taken south to race in Florida and Louisiana, and some are taken to California. In the spring of the year these horses and dogs return north and to the midwestern tracks.

The stopping of the transportation of these horses and dogs from State to State would mean that the betting public would not be familiar with the performances and abilities of particular horses and dogs racing at out-of-State tracks. A discussion with any horse or dog bettor will unquestionably convince anyone that such bettors want to bet on horses or dogs which they have seen race before. They have no particular interest in betting on horses or dogs which they have not seen race because they have no yardstick by which to satisfy their minds as to their real ability.

Accordingly, when the horses would go south, I am positive there would be a great decrease in illegal gambling; for example, in the Northern States during the winter months, where the bettors would not have seen the horses run which would then be running at the tracks in the Southern States. The converse is likewise true. The withdrawal of the stimuli for betting for a period of 4 or 5 months will cause many persons to lose their interest in betting on horses and dogs, and over a not too long a period of time I believe that a public apathy would develop as far as such gambling was concerned.

There can be no doubt in anyone's mind that the great increase in the number of tracks which are now in existence in this country has in a large measure stimulated the public interest in gambling. The Attorney General of the United States, J. Howard McGrath, stated:

The country was allowed to drift into laxity, as a result, I suppose, of the tremendous increase in legalized betting within the last 10 years. This is a new problem.

If you go back in your mind to 10 or 15 years ago, there were very few race tracks around the United States. Since that time more than half of the States have provided for legalized betting, and this is an evil that has grown out of the fact that people have been made conscious of how to bet on horses.

I daresay, if any member of this committee can go back 10 years in his mind, he would not know how to bet on a horse; you would not know what it meant when you said "Win, place, show," or any of those other things. Yet, there is no citizen in the United States today that does not understand these terms.

So, it is an evil that has grown up out of a new social condition, shall we say, that has been created in the United States.

Now, whether it is a wise policy to have legal betting on this side of the fence and the same thing to be illegal on the other side of the fence is a matter of question.

The States have seen fit to do it. They have set it up that way. And our people, for the most part, do not feel there is anything very morally wrong if they go into the corner periodical store and put \$2 on a horse. It is not morally wrong to them whether they do it that way or go out to a race track and pay an admission and put it through a parimutuel machine. (Hearings before the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, U. S. Senate, 81st Cong., 2d sess. and 82d Cong., 1st sess., pursuant to S. Res. 202 (81st Cong.), p. 518, Monday, March 26, 1951).

That is the testimony of the Attorney General of the United States, Mr. President.

An analysis of the hearings held before the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, the so-called Kefauver committee, certainly adds considerable weight to the conclusion that the legalization of gambling has resulted in a tremendous upsurge in gambling. This committee held hearings in 13 cities throughout the United States wherein gambling activities were carried on on a large scale. Ten of these cities were located in States where gambling on horse and dog races has been legalized. This appears to me to be a very significant fact.

Only two arguments can be advanced against the enactment of a bill such as the one I have introduced. The first is

that such action would constitute an infringement of States' rights. There can be no support for this proposition. The conduct of racing at legalized gambling enclosures would still be permitted; furthermore, horses and dogs could still be transported from State to State for any purpose other than for racing at enclosures where betting takes place or money prizes are awarded. For example, if a horse owner in the State of Maryland still desired to continue his stable, he could have a mare studded in Kentucky and returned. The offspring could thereafter race in the State of Maryland or the home-grown variety could be used. As pointed out in the Fred Othman article, which I have read earlier, it is sheer buncombe to say that the average bettor goes to a race track to admire the beauty or performance of the horse. He is interested in the announcement from the loud-speaker as to whether the nag on which he has some money bet is in the running.

The other argument which has oftentimes been advanced when anything is ever mentioned about racing is that horse racing and dog racing are for the improvement of the breed. This argument went out with the mechanized age. A study of the hearings that have been held many times in the past in Congress will show that this argument has always been advanced, the desire to improve the breed being predicated on the statement that better horses were needed for the United States Army Cavalry Remount Service; but as all of us know, the United States Army Cavalry Remount Service has been abolished.

I do not say that the enactment of this bill would result in the abolishment of all types of illegal gambling. We are all aware of the fact that gambling is a very human trait. For example, it reminds me of a current story of the students at a western university who were found to be betting quite heavily on football games; and when the faculty prohibited such betting and made it grounds for expulsion, the students then held a pool and took bets on when the dean's pregnant wife would have a baby, whether or not it would be a boy or a girl, and how much it would weigh. This story is related by me only to point out that bettors will always find some medium to enable them to bet.

However, if this body is serious about curtailing off-track gambling on horse and dog racing, I state with all assurance that the enactment of this bill will cause a marked apathy among the betting public. Once we achieve this lessening of interest, I am convinced that as time goes on this apathy will increase. In any event, we shall have at least made the problem a local one which can be handled by the States themselves.

Mr. President, in this connection I call attention to a companion bill which I now ask unanimous consent to introduce. The title of the bill is "To require the keeping of certain records in connection with betting on horse and dog racing." I wish to give a brief explanation of the bill. First, I shall read the bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 54 of the Internal Revenue Code (relating to rec-

ords and special returns) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(h) Racing enclosures.—

"(1) All operators of racing enclosures wherein betting is legalized by State law are required to file forms containing the name and address of all persons to whom fifty dollars (\$50), or more, is paid. It shall be the duty of the operators of such racing enclosures to require the recipients of fifty dollars (\$50), or more, to properly identify themselves.

"(2) All amounts paid to any persons by the operators of such racing enclosures shall be considered net profit to such persons unless they obtain and preserve a receipt other than a pari-mutuel ticket from the operators of such tracks for the amounts of moneys wagered by such persons on losing entries, such receipt to be obtained at the time that the pari-mutuel ticket is purchased, and containing the purchaser's name and address, entry bought and amount bet.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1627) to require the keeping of certain records in connection with betting on horse and dog racing, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in America today there is only one business which is not required to keep Form 1099. That is the racing business. True, the forms are kept as to their employees, and so forth, but this accounts for only a portion of the expenses which inure to the track out of its 10 percent or more cut of the total handled. The bill would reach the billions of dollars which are bet annually, as to which no accounting whatsoever is presently required. The tracks keep no records of the names of persons to whom they pay winning wagers, nor do they keep records of the names of persons who wager at the tracks. The Bureau of Internal Revenue will confirm the fact that many tax violators, when found with cash on hand—sometimes amounting to thousands upon thousands of dollars—claim to have won the money on bets at racing enclosures. If this bill is enacted, the Bureau of Internal Revenue will have the names of all persons who have won \$50 or more at one time. Further, the bill will prevent such persons from claiming as losses on betting amounts as to which today all that would be required would be to preserve the pari-mutuel tickets on losing horses or dogs. These losing tickets can be picked up by the millions of dollars every year on the floors of the tracks, where they have been thrown by persons who have lost, after the results were announced. Under this bill, such pari-mutuel tickets on such losing wagers would be meaningless. The result would be that millions upon millions upon millions of dollars would go into the Treasury of the United States, instead of going, as now is the case, to a bunch of crooks who gather up such tickets after they are thrown away at the tracks.

Any person who would be betting reasonably high amounts would obtain from the pari-mutuel seller a receipt giving his name, address, horse or dog bet on, and the amount paid. The receipt would be stamped by the official

stamping device. Without such a receipt, a bettor would not be able to deduct any losses against his winnings; and his winnings would have come to the attention of the Bureau of Internal Revenue by virtue of the requirement compelling the operators of the tracks to file Form 1099.

Mr. President, in addition to the reasons I have already stated for enactment of the bill, I believe I should call attention to the fact that today all householders who employ persons, even domestics, being paid \$50 or more a month are required to file forms stating this fact. The same reasoning applies to the payment of winnings to bettors.

This bill is, however, not strictly a revenue-raising measure requiring introduction first in the House by the Ways and Means Committee. The requirement as to the keeping of records will, however, enable the Bureau of Internal Revenue to locate the revenue and collect the taxes due.

Mr. President—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I shall yield in a moment.

Before I yield, Mr. President, let me say that I have been horrified, when picking up the newspapers, regardless of the part of the United States in which I travel, just as I was horrified when I listened to some of the testimony before the Kefauver committee, to learn that some of the gamblers say, "Yes; I have \$40,000 or \$50,000 at home, but I won it at a race track," or "I won it in Florida at a dog race." Mr. President, the enactment of this bill will not interfere in any manner whatsoever with legalized gambling in the States in accordance with State law, but in my opinion the bill will have a very fine effect on the raising of revenue in behalf of the taxpayers of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question was whether the Senator's bill would be broad enough to prohibit the shipment of dogs, for instance, to exhibitions where field prizes, both in money and otherwise, might be awarded, and also the shipment of horses and dogs in connection with shows, fairs, and so forth.

Mr. LANGER. I particularly stated that this bill would exempt horses and dogs shipped for those purposes, and also when shipped for the purpose of improving breeds.

Mr. FERGUSON. So it would not cover the shipment of dogs for the purpose of competing for field prizes?

Mr. LANGER. That is correct. It would exempt them.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the question now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is an amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois, on page 2, line 17.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McMahon
Anderson	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Moody
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	O'Connor
Butler, Md.	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Pastore
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Cain	Jenner	Saltonstall
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smathers
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kefauver	Sparkman
Connally	Kem	Stennis
Cordon	Langer	Taft
Dirksen	Lehman	Thye
Douglas	Lodge	Underwood
Dworshak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Welker
Eaton	Malone	Wherry
Ellender	Maybank	Wiley
Ferguson	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	Young
Frear	McFarland	
George	McKellar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico withhold his request? I should like to submit an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, and the Senate will have to vote first on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The offer of an amendment by the Senator from Delaware is not in order at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator from Delaware out of order because the yeas and nays had been asked for? They have not yet been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; that is not the point. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Delaware would be an amendment in the third degree and would be, therefore, not in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can ask for a reconsideration of the action of the Senate in rejecting on yesterday the House provision, can I not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment must first be disposed of.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was my understanding that the amendment would be in order. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would save only \$94,445. If we should adopt all the amendments of the Senator from Illinois the bill would still carry more money than was appropriated in 1950. I do not want to support an amendment which will give an agency more money than it had last year. As the Senator from Illinois has stated, we must take out a little more of the fat, and in addition to that, a little of the meat. We are not even cutting the fat out of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is all right to take out the fat, but we should not take out the common sense, too.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Illinois to state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I understand—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that the amendment which I have offered to the committee amendment is an amendment in the second degree, and that any amendment to my amendment would be in the third degree and would, therefore, be out of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I asked for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. It is in order, is it not, when a point of order is raised, for the Senator who made the point to present his observations as to why he feels that the point of order should be sustained? Is not that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would have some discretion.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. I hope the distinguished occupant of the Chair will recognize the Senator from Delaware in order that he may at least present his argument on the point of order, even though his amendment may be out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the Senator had stated the reasons, but the Chair will permit him to restate them. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not understand why I lost the floor in the first place.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware offered an amendment which was out of order. He lost the floor when the Chair ruled that it was out of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think the Record will show that I was stating why I wanted to present an amendment. Is

there no way by which I can offer an amendment without the Senate first voting on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that there is no way by which that may be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I merely want to point out that even though the Senate adopts the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, only \$14,445 would be saved in the Office of the Solicitor, and that same agency operated for \$1,000,000 in 1950 and in 1951 for a quarter of the amount. I think the taxpayers might as well know that while great speeches favoring economy are made on the floor of the Senate, if efforts to save money are going to be ruled out of order, we will not get anywhere with this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested, and they are ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to discuss the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, although I do not expect to support all the amendments he proposes to offer.

When our Government was established it was understood that the legislative branch should enact laws and that the executive branch should apply them. It is only natural that some laws enacted should be misunderstood by the branch of the Government which is supposed to apply them. So it was provided that when there was any doubt as to the meaning of a law enacted by the Congress, the agency of the executive branch which was concerned could apply to the Attorney General for an interpretation of the law. However, as time went on, various departments established solicitors' offices and departed from the practice of applying to the Attorney General for interpretation of acts of Congress to such an extent that in 1949 only 33 formal opinions and interpretations were made by the Attorney General's office.

The Solicitors' offices in some of the departments have grown so very large and so very expensive that they have become one of the major problems of the Government. To too great an extent the solicitor and his staff, who are employed by the head of a department, are engaged in misinterpreting acts of Congress and pointing out means by which the head of the department may successfully evade complying with the intent of the Congress. I think we could well cut some of the personnel and the appropriations for most of the solicitors' offices. I realize that they have some able lawyers. They have certain papers to make out, and they have quite a bit of work for lawyers to do, but they constitute one of the major problems of good government by spending too much of their time in figuring out ways to evade the intent of the Congress.

Therefore, Mr. President, I support the first amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In order to indicate to the Senator from Vermont, for whom I

have the greatest respect as a legislator and as a citizen, what the committee had in mind and was trying to accomplish, I may say that on page 19 of the report it will be seen that the bill, as to that item, contains \$51,715 less than the amount appropriated for 1951. It is \$10,555 under the budget estimate, and only \$19,000 over the House figure. We believed those items are completely justified.

I am in deep sympathy with the objectives of the Senator from Vermont. I know that in many instances departments will do what the Senator has in mind to be done. But if the Senator will only read the statement I made to the Senate concerning this item when we began the debate he will realize that the committee went the limit. The report is not partisan in any sense. The report to the full committee was made by a subcommittee, whose members from both sides of the aisle were in complete harmony. I hope the Senator will bear that in mind.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont does not pretend to know the exact number of dollars required to make it possible for the necessary legal work of each department to be performed. The Senator from Vermont is depending upon the Senator from Illinois to produce information as to the correct number of dollars to be provided for this particular solicitor's office. But, so far as the Senator from Vermont is concerned, he would like to find some way of eliminating every dollar which is spent by the various solicitors' offices in finding ways to evade the intent of the Congress.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations which handled the bill began hearings on the 3rd of April. The Senator from Illinois is not a member of the subcommittee. He did not hear any of the testimony given to the subcommittee. The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New Mexico, and other Senators heard that testimony. Does the Senator from Vermont expect a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to have heard as much evidence on this matter as a member of the subcommittee dealing with the subject? All I ask is that he give just as much consideration to members of the Appropriations Committee who took part in the discussion of the bill and in listening to the justifications of the bill, as to other Senators.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont knows that the House provided \$1,650,000 for this item, which the Senator from Illinois would reduce to \$1,255,000. The Senator from Vermont is sure that if evidence is produced before the conferees that the amount proposed by the Senator from Illinois is altogether too low to permit the Solicitor's Office to function effectively and properly—and I emphasize the word "properly"—the conferees will then be in a position to correct any inadvertent injustice which the Senate might have committed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Do I understand the Senator from Vermont to intimate that the Senator from Illinois knows more concerning the justifications for this item than do the Senator from New Mexico and the members of the subcommittee who heard the evidence?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont has so much confidence in both the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from New Mexico that he would not care to answer that question. On this particular point, however, since there will be ample opportunity to correct any injustice we may make in the Senate, I prefer to go along with the Senator from Illinois, and see if there is any possible way to keep the Solicitor's Offices from spending such a large percentage of their time in trying to find some way successfully to evade the intent of Congress.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The next time a bill is reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I feel I could be justified, in view of the remarks of the Senator from Vermont, in going to some member of the Committee on Finance to find out what the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry meant by their report on a bill.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will keep in mind that various departments of Government are being overstaffed with attorneys, with planners, and with charters. The Senator from Michigan does not feel that simply because of the fact that he is a member of the Appropriations Committee such matters as we are now discussing should not have full and complete discussion on the floor, engaged in by Senators who are not members of the committee.

Anyone who is familiar with the practice of law knows that after the laws are passed and have been interpreted for a number of years in a department, the work becomes more or less clerical. We find, however, that every time we pass a new law applying to a particular department, that department comes to Congress the next year and wants more lawyers in order that they can interpret the new statute.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from Michigan agree that the solicitor of a department is not in any position to give an impartial interpretation of an act of Congress when he knows that the department head wants it interpreted in a certain way? He is employed by the department head, and if he does not interpret an act of Congress in a manner satisfactory to the department head, he may lose his job. The Attorney General, who should render an impartial interpretation, is not applied to at all because the department head could not dismiss him if he gave him a "wrong" interpretation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has hit the nail

squarely on the head. So long as the Government continues to permit every agency, every bureau, and subbureau, to have its own lawyers and its own interpreters of the law, instead of submitting questions of law to the Attorney General, we are going to receive very poor interpretations of laws.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote for the proposed cut.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is all very well to take the position Senators have just taken, but we should remember our own responsibility in connection with this matter. If there is an office of Solicitor in the Department of Labor it is because the Congress of the United States created the office. If we are really sincere in our desire to save, we should pass legislation abolishing all such offices. But after we create positions and impose duties upon those occupying them, we should consider our responsibilities in connection with making adequate appropriations so as to make it possible for those occupying the positions to carry out the duties we have imposed upon them. If we want to do more than simply give lip service to economy, let us introduce legislation abolishing all such offices. I might vote in favor of such proposed legislation.

Mr. President, members of the committee on both sides of the aisle have worked hard and diligently on this subject. I have told the Senate that in this particular instance the only question involved is whether the Senate committee was justified in adding \$19,000. In order to bring about economy we made a reduction totaling \$51,000 under the 1951 appropriation, and \$80,000 under the budget figure. The committee, however, did not feel justified in ruining the function completely. Of course, money can be saved by Congress. Congress can do away with all appropriations. The Senate has the authority to do that. But do we want to carry on orderly processes of government? Do we want to accept our responsibility? There is an Office of Solicitor in the Department of Labor. Do we want that Office to function? Yes; but properly, and without waste. If we want it to function properly, it is our duty not to sabotage its work, but to provide the Office annually with the necessary funds to enable it to carry on in a proper manner.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], because it is better than no saving at all. I have great respect for the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], but I point out that the adoption of this amendment would be far from sabotaging any of the work of the Office in question, because even if we adopt the amendment, this particular Office of the Department will still have 50 percent more money than it had in 1950.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 2, beginning in line 17. On this question the yeas and nays

have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE and Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON]. If present and voting the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay," and the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay," and the Senator from California would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] is necessarily absent and is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio would vote "yea" and the Senator from Nevada would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is necessarily absent and paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is absent because of illness is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—47

Aiken	Ferguson	Moody
Bennett	Flanders	Mundt
Benton	Frear	O'Connor
Brewster	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Jenner	Taft
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Capehart	Kem	Watkins
Carlson	Lodge	Welker
Dirksen	Long	Wherry
Douglas	Malone	Wiley
Dworshak	McCarthy	Williams
Eastland	McClellan	Young
Eaton	McMahon	

NAYS—29

Anderson	Hill	McKellar
Chavez	Hunt	Monroney
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kefauver	Pastore
Ellender	Langer	Smathers
George	Lehman	Sparkman
Green	Magnuson	Stennis
Hayden	Maybank	Underwood
Hennings	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—20

Bricker	Kerr	Neely
Case	Kilgore	Nixon
Duff	Knowland	Russell
Fulbright	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Gillette	MCCarran	Smith, N. C.
Holland	Millikin	Tobey
Humphrey	Murray	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 6-7-51-V. The amendment is offered in behalf of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr.

BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and myself.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if I may interrupt the Senator from Michigan, to make a suggestion?

Mr. FERGUSON. I should be glad to do so provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan may do so without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask that I may address an inquiry to the Senator from Illinois without the Senator from Michigan losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois was very decisive. Would the Senator from Illinois agree that, so far as the remainder of his amendments are concerned, they be accepted by the committee and taken to conference?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would appreciate it very much. It would save time. I should like to have the privilege of submitting now, if I may—

Mr. FERGUSON. Just a moment, Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan cannot consent to such procedure, because it would mean that his amendment would become an amendment in the third degree, and, therefore, would not be in order. I believe we should consider first of all the amendment which I am offering.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, he has the floor. I am trying to save a little time. I ask unanimous consent that we may proceed in the manner I have suggested without the Senator from Michigan losing his right to offer his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan cannot consent to such procedure at the present moment. He believes the Senate should first vote on the amendment which he has offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 42, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 703. Each appropriation or authorization made by this act for any purpose, of which a specified portion is herein made available for personal services, and each amount so specified as being available for personal services, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me trace briefly the background of this amendment. It is directed at the tremendous overload of civilian employment in the Federal Government. I have some statistics which reflect that overload.

The House of Representatives sought to attack this problem by adopting the so-called Jensen amendment. I regret exceedingly that the Senate committee has seen fit to abandon the formula for reducing Government personnel which the Jensen amendment represents. I think it is effective, painless, and with the perfections I had supported that it was administratively practicable.

I protested the abandonment of the Jensen amendment in the committee, and this action is designed to repair some of the damage done by abandoning the Jensen amendment.

The Jensen amendment was admirably simple and completely painless. It used the simple device of placing a bar upon filling more than one out of four vacancies in Federal civilian employment caused by resignation, death, and so on. It was painless because no one would have been fired. But the payrolls would have been reduced materially as natural causes reduced them.

One of the reasons that I regret the abandonment of the Jensen amendment is that it contained a feature which was one of the best breaks conscientious and able Federal employees have ever had. The amendment specified that its bar against filling vacancies would not apply to promotions within an agency. In other words, it would have provided an inducement for the promotion of qualified men and women to important positions where vacancies had occurred. The present percentage cut in personal services funds gives no attention to that very significant inducement and source of encouragement to hard-working, ambitious, Government employees.

On this particular bill the Jensen amendment, as it passed the House, had no terminal point. But in line with a version of the amendment which had been attached to other bills in the House, we had proposed that it become inoperative when the payrolls had been reduced by 20 percent. I believe those of us who supported the amendment and its principle were even willing to limit its application to a 10-percent cut if that was necessary to gain its acceptance.

Largely upon representations from the Bureau of the Budget, which I dare say could not have been expected to say otherwise than that the formula was not desirable, the committee abandoned the Jensen formula. Instead it adopted a formula which cuts from the various appropriation items where personal services are involved a sum corresponding to 5 percent of the amount which had been requested in the budget for personal services. Wherever that is done the committee has placed a limitation upon personal services within the appropriation item, and that limitation corresponds to 95 percent of the budget request for personal services.

At this point I wish to refer to the bill and invite the attention of Senators to the items which would be covered by the amendment.

Let us take page 2. On line 13 the amount as proposed was \$1,400,000. That has been cut by the amendment of

the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to \$1,000,000. Of that amount not more than \$1,250,136 shall be available for personal services.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from Michigan repeat the figures he has read? Do I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Delaware was that not more than \$1,000,000 shall be spent by the Department of Labor, of which not less than \$1,250,136 shall be available for personal services? How is it possible to spend for personal services a sum in excess of the total amount appropriated? My ears may have deceived me, but that is what I understood the Senator from Michigan to say.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to ask at this time whether the million-dollar figure applied to both figures mentioned on line 13.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan thought it so applied. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Did the amendment of the Senator from Delaware cover both items?

Mr. DOUGLAS. What did the Senator from Michigan read? Will he repeat what he has read?

Mr. FERGUSON. I read this: "\$1,400,000, of which not more than"—I understand that the next figure was changed to "\$1,000,000"—"shall be available for personal services."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the amendment, as read by the Senator from Michigan, provided that the total appropriation should be not more than "\$1,000,000, of which not more than \$1,225,000"—obviously an impossibility.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should not have read that figure. I shall take an item on page 3, which has not yet been touched by any floor amendment.

Mr. President, I wish to tell the Senate now that the pending amendment calling for a 10-percent cut in personal services applies only to the items in the bill in which the following language is used: "of which not more than"—and then a figure is indicated by leaving a blank space—"shall be available for personal services."

This is language placing a limitation on personal services. The language of my amendment makes clear that the amendment applies only to items where that limitation appears.

That means that I do not attempt by the amendment to eliminate the employment of nurses and doctors who actually render services to those who are ill in hospitals. If Senators will turn to page 24 of the bill, they will find an item of \$30,200,000 for hospitals and medical care. That item would not be touched by this amendment because the item does not contain the limiting language "of which not more than ——— shall be available for personal services."

Mr. President, the amendment would not cover the item on page 29, for instance, reading as follows:

St. Elizabeths Hospital * * * treatment of mental illness, \$2,135,000.

Because the additional limiting language to which I have referred does not appear in that case.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder whether Senators who propose amendments calling for cuts in appropriation items for the physical welfare of the people of the Nation are willing to stand responsible for the results of those cuts.

Mr. FERGUSON. I apologize to the Senator, but I could not hear his question.

Mr. KILGORE. I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan and many other Senators who have urged the adoption of amendments calling for cuts in the appropriations which affect the physical welfare of the people of the Nation are personally willing, individually, to stand responsible for the results of those cuts and to take the blame in that connection.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I feel that I am perfectly satisfied to be judged both by my votes in the committee and by everything I advocate in the committee and by my votes on the floor and everything I advocate on the floor. I do not believe in advocating anything which is opposed to the welfare of the country.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, let us not pass the blame on to the committee, but let us place the blame upon those who advocate certain cuts.

Personally, I am willing to assume the responsibility for the cuts I urge. I think every Senator who urges the making of a cut in appropriations affecting the physical well-being of the people of the United States should take into consideration the number of persons who cannot measure up to the physical standards required for service in the Armed Forces and also the number of welfare cases. So I think every Senator who urges the making of a cut in these appropriations should be willing not only to assume responsibility for such cuts as a member of a Senate committee but also should be willing to assume individual responsibility for them as a representative of the people of his State.

I am asking the Senator from Michigan whether he is willing to assume that responsibility.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have stated that I am willing to assume full responsibility for my votes and for my State.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I intend to submit an amendment to the amendment the Sen-

ator from Michigan has submitted, and, in view of what he has said about protecting the health activities of the United States, I wish to ask whether the Senator from Michigan will accept my amendment to his amendment? The amendment which I would submit to his amendment reads as follows:

At the end of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, change the period to a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That this section shall not apply to appropriations of the Public Health Service for hospitals and medical care, foreign quarantine service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, mental health activities, National Heart Institute, and dental health activities.

All of them relate, of course, to the protection of the health of the people of the Nation.

In view of what the Senator from Michigan has previously said, I wonder whether he will accept this amendment as a part of his own amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot accept the amendment because I feel that no exception should be made to the proposition that Federal agencies can stand a 10-percent personnel cut without impairing their functions. It must be borne in mind that the cuts provided by this amendment apply only to employees of the Federal Government, and have no effect either upon grants to States or State employees. The amendment calling for a 5-percent reduction in Federal personnel was approved by the Appropriations Committee, and I merely propose to extend the scope of those cuts since I feel that employment in positions in the Federal Government should be cut at least 10 percent below the budget estimates.

That is all we are trying to do by means of this amendment—namely, to reduce by 10 percent the Budget estimates for the salaries of employees of the Federal Government—not employees of the States, but only Federal Government employees.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was under the impression that the Senator from Michigan had said that his amendment would not affect the doctors and nurses in hospitals; and, of course, I assumed that his purpose was to go a step further in protection of the health needs of the people of the Nation. Certainly the work done in the National Institutes of Health, the Cancer Institute, in mental health activities, in the Heart Institute, and so forth, is just as much in the interest of the protection of the health of the people as are doctors and nurses, although, of course, doctors and nurses are paramount in their importance.

Mr. FERGUSON. The only result of this amendment will be to cut down the overhead of the Federal Government agencies, not the agencies in the States.

For instance, in the State of the Senator from New York, in New York City, there is an agency engaged in research work in heart disease, cancer, and so forth. That agency is operated either by a private hospital, a municipal hospital, or a State hospital. The same is true in the case of the State of Michigan. However, this amendment will not make any cuts in the funds going to those services and, consequently, cannot affect those services or the local employees. This amendment will apply only to Federal Government employees who are covered by the budget and are directly affected by this particular appropriation.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for that purpose?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to address a question to the Presiding Officer. I intend to submit the amendment I have stated to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I wish to be informed at what particular time in the proceedings I shall be entitled to submit my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will have the privilege of submitting his amendment to the amendment at any time when he can obtain recognition in his own right.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall make one or two inquiries, the purpose of which it is necessary to explain. It would appear that we are now in the middle of an operation on the Senate floor which again emphasizes the vice of legislating on the floor rather than in committee because we end up by becoming so confused that it is difficult to know just what the situation is with reference to a bill at any given time. The Senator from Michigan is offering his amendment, which, I take it, is intended to effect an additional 5 percent reduction in both appropriations and limitations to that which was recommended by the Appropriations Committee. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Where the Appropriations Committee applied a 5-percent cut in salaries, my amendment would take another 5 percent off, for a total reduction of 10 percent on personal services, and on no other items.

Mr. CORDON. That is what I understood was the purpose of the amendment. I now call the attention of the Senator to the present parliamentary situation. In the first item on page 2, the Senate has adopted an amendment which eliminates entirely both lines 13 and 14, and substitutes therefor the figure or the sum of \$1,000,000. Therefore,

with respect to that item, there will be nothing upon which the Senator's amendment can operate, there is no specified amount for salaries, nor is there a specified limitation; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. While I feel that this body is wholly wrong in the action it has been taking in eliminating from this bill the only salary-control provision which has ever been in an appropriation act since I have been in the Senate, I may say, that is a matter for the Senate to determine. But, when it has so determined it, it makes ineffective the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, because there is nothing upon which the amendment may operate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, and I quite agree with the Senator on the importance of this congressional control over employment which the committee's limitations provide, and which my amendment merely enlarges.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator feels that way about it; does he?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I do; and that is correct.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUNT. I was rather intrigued by the statement of the Senator from Michigan that a straight across-the-board cut would not in any way reduce medical services. I think the Senator is in error, for the appropriations of grants-in-aid to the various State departments, the various health departments, the salaries of those in charge of the cancer program, and of those in charge of the dental program, are paid with Federal funds.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, but the Senator from Michigan will cite the record now, which shows that those items for salaries which are covered in grants are not affected by this amendment. The wording of the amendment does not affect them, and I shall give the Senator an example in connection with the heart appropriation. The amount for personal services is \$1,498,351. Another item is object No. 11, "grants, subsidies, and contributions." Those are the ones which go to the State and cover the payroll or any expense of a hospital or research department, clinic, or anything else, the amount being \$7,500,000. We only touch the personal-service item, which is object classification 01 in the budget. I wanted to make that clear.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the Senator for his explanation, because I do not think that had been made clear.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. IVES. The senior Senator from New York would like to support the re-

marks made by his colleague, the junior Senator from New York. The senior Senator from New York feels that the proposal of the junior Senator from New York has a considerable amount of merit. While I do not happen to have in my possession a copy of the amendment, it occurs to me that if the amendment is of the type which it would appear to be, and if it will not affect the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan any more than it presumably will affect it, there should be no reason why it should not be accepted. What damage is there in the amendment of the junior Senator from New York, insofar as the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is concerned, if it is not going to do any more than what the Senator from Michigan says it would do?

Mr. FERGUSON. This is what it would do. It would eliminate the additional 5-percent cut in the appropriation of \$1,463,333 for personal services in the National Heart Institute. In the case of the item for personal services in the National Cancer Institute it would eliminate the 5-percent cut on \$2,694,760, but it would not touch grants, subsidies, and contributions of \$11,115,000.

Mr. IVES. Then it would in effect curtail the public health services, would it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would affect only the personal services of the overseeing agency here in Washington; and the Senator from Michigan feels that that particular agency can stand a 10-percent cut along with all others. The committee felt that it could stand a 5-percent cut, and did make a 5-percent cut for personal services in that particular item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Along the lines suggested by the senior Senator from New York, if he will follow the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan, he will observe that there are no exemptions whatever, on whatever personnel may be necessary. Grants to the State of New York for the particular functions of cancer research, heart research, and mental-health research, would in no way be exempt under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan; and, even if the amendment were to be accepted, I am unable to see how it would do any harm to have the exemptions suggested by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I cannot at all see it.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is but 5 percent, as the Senator from Michigan has said, and on Federal personal services alone, not on services paid for out of the grants.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If it would apply to Washington only, yes; but if certain contributions are to be made to the State of New York for those particular things, in connection with the Public Health Service, it would be necessary to have Federal personnel in order to adminis-

ter the particular contribution to the State of New York or to any other State. But the amendment does not exempt any of those at all. If it were confined merely to employees within the District of Columbia, it might possibly be acceptable. That is the way I understand it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Contributions are not affected. An examination of page 25, line 20, under the National Cancer Institute, shows that the total appropriation is \$19,805,171, "of which not more than \$2,694,760 shall be available for personal services." It is only this latter amount which is affected. The item of \$2,694,760 is now 95 percent of the budget estimate. The figure which the Senator from Michigan desires to insert represents another cut of 5 percent, making that an item of 90 percent of the budget. In other words, that figure would become \$2,552,931.

At this time I should like to make as part of my remarks a report showing each one of the items which my amendment would affect and how it would affect it. I ask that the table be kept on the desk so that any Senator who desires to do so may refer to it, to ascertain what particular item would be cut. I should note that it was prepared prior to today's session and therefore does not take into consideration floor action taken today. As an example, my amendment no longer applies on the first item listed, since the Senate has acted to reduce the appropriation below the limitation on personal services of \$1,184,339, which my amendment would have accomplished.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to lie on the desk and to be printed in the RECORD at this point, as follows:

NOTES IN RE ATTACHED TABLE ON EFFECT OF FERGUSON AMENDMENT

In general: As a substitute for the Jensen amendment the committee reduced all items in the bill containing money for personal service.

To arrive at the amount of reduction the committee allowed 95 percent of the funds requested in the President's budget for personal service; wrote a restriction to this effect against each item involved; and reduced the over-all appropriation figure accordingly.

In a few instances prior reductions by the committee resulted in funds available for personal service of less than 95 percent of the President's request; in these cases the additional 5-percent cut was not imposed and the restriction on funds available for personal service was not added.

The effect of the Ferguson amendment would be:

To limit funds for personal service to 90 percent of the President's budget requests.

To arrive at this result the amendment applies a further reduction of 5 percent on personal services to each appropriation item in the bill which includes funds for personal services to which the committee's restricting amendments have been applied.

It does not apply to any item which has not been reduced specifically in funds for personal service by the committee.

The attached table shows by item the effect of the Ferguson amendment as if each of the items in the bill containing personal service funds were amended separately.

Ferguson amendment

[If adopted the Ferguson amendment specifically would amend H. R. 3709 as follows (with adjustments for supplementals submitted after the budget document was received)]

Amendment No.	Title	Appropriation	Page	Line	Strike out	Substitute	And strike out	Substitute
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR								
1	I	Office of the Secretary, salaries and expenses	2	13	\$1,400,000	\$1,334,203	\$1,250,000	\$1,184,339
2	I	Office of Solicitor, salaries and expenses	2	17	1,669,445	1,588,895	1,530,546	1,449,996
3	I	Bureau of Labor Standards	3	10 and 11	688,000	656,165	604,870	573,035
4	I	Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights	3	23 and 24	265,758	254,516	213,603	202,361
5	I	Bureau of Apprenticeship	4	5 and 6	2,578,682	2,465,364	2,153,049	2,039,731
6	I	Bureau of Employment Security	4	20 and 23	5,245,959	5,016,919	4,351,773	4,122,733
7	I	Grants to States, unemployment compensation	5	12	164,560,000	164,525,945	647,037	612,982
8	I	Bureau of Employees' Compensation	7	19 and 20	1,887,816	1,802,632	1,618,499	1,533,315
9	I	Bureau of Labor Statistics	9	7 and 8	5,371,352	5,132,891	4,530,755	4,292,294
10	I	Revision, Consumers' Price Index	9	16	1,125,000	1,072,825	991,323	939,148
11	I	Women's Bureau	9	23	379,235	362,570	317,581	300,866
12	I	Wage and Hour Division	10	11 and 12	8,365,304	7,995,508	7,119,227	6,749,431
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY								
13	II	Columbia Institution for the Deaf	11	13	374,537	359,074	293,805	278,342
14	II	Food and Drug Administration	12	7 and 8	5,172,975	4,950,950	4,218,475	3,996,450
15	II	Freedmen's Hospital	13	8	2,631,406	2,523,406	2,053,786	1,945,692
16	II	Office of Education	15	20 and 21	3,397,706	3,245,413	2,893,577	2,741,284
17	II	Office of Vocational Rehabilitation	17-18	24 and 1	21,500,000	21,495,403	87,346	82,749
18	II	Salaries and expenses	19	2	675,620	646,240	558,220	528,840
Public Health Service:								
19	II	Veneral disease	20	13 and 14	11,653,360	11,506,725	2,786,157	2,639,522
20	II	Tuberculosis	20	17 and 18	8,887,351	7,774,703	2,140,323	2,027,675
21	II	Assistance to States, general	21	2 and 3	15,960,000	15,859,951	1,900,944	1,800,895
22	II	Communicable diseases	21	13 and 14	5,915,747	5,686,101	4,450,816	4,221,170
23	II	Engineering, sanitation, etc.	22	1 and 2	3,648,158	3,496,316	2,885,004	2,733,162
24	II	Disease investigations, etc., Alaska	22	19	1,211,129	1,188,258	434,547	411,676
25	II	Hospital construction, salaries and expenses	23	19	1,166,465	1,112,930	1,017,165	963,630
26	II	Foreign Quarantine Service	24	20 and 21	2,868,029	2,736,058	2,507,458	2,375,487
27	II	National Institutes of Health	25	8 and 9	15,559,973	15,319,946	4,590,505	4,320,478
28	II	National Cancer Institute	25	20 and 21	19,805,171	19,663,342	2,694,760	2,552,931
29	II	Mental health activities	26	3 and 4	10,737,974	10,675,948	1,178,489	1,116,463
30	II	National Heart Institute	26	11 and 12	10,072,982	9,995,964	1,463,333	1,386,315
31	II	Dental health activities	26	17 and 18	1,697,308	1,644,616	1,001,156	948,464
32	II	Construction of research facilities	27	22 and 23	6,635,540	6,631,080	84,740	80,230
33	II	Commissioned officers' pay, etc.	28	9 and 10	1,861,500	1,823,000	731,500	693,000
34	II	Public Health, salaries and expenses	29	2 and 3	2,745,868	2,623,736	2,320,514	2,198,382
35	II	Social Security Administration:						
		Bureau of Federal Credit Unions	29 and 30	23 and 1	167,650	160,300	614,650	582,300
36	II	Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance	30	7 to 10	57,437,980	54,874,960	48,697,378	46,134,358
37	II	Bureau of Public Assistance	31	5	1,600,000	1,523,400	1,455,400	1,378,800
38	II	Children's Bureau	31	13	1,500,000	1,434,795	1,238,900	1,173,695
39	II	Office of the Administrator:						
		Division of Service Operations	34	2 and 4	711,500	690,340	402,045	380,885
40	II	Office of the General Counsel	34	12	369,478	326,956		
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD								
41	III	Salaries and expenses	36	15	8,233,959	7,885,418	6,622,284	6,273,743
NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD								
42	IV	Salaries and expenses	37	7 and 8	394,247	378,494	299,307	283,554
43	IV	Arbitration and emergency boards	37	16	144,000	138,000	114,000	108,000
44	IV	National Railroad Adjustment Board	37	22 and 23	600,000	575,749	460,774	436,523
RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD								
45	V	Salaries and expenses	39	10 to 12	5,056,904	4,845,808	4,010,820	3,799,724
FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE								
46	VI	Salaries and expenses	40	3	3,047,000	2,911,913	2,566,653	2,431,566
47	VI	Boards of inquiry	40	11	48,750	47,500	23,750	22,500

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I take pleasure in yielding to the chairman of the subcommittee for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator, I think, was referring to the figures on page 25, in line 21; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The \$2,694,760 is the figure which would prevail if we were to make the 5-percent cut under the so-called Cordon amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, it would take 5 percent more from these figures.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. It would take 5 percent more by making it a 10-percent cut from the budget estimate instead of a 5-percent cut, and the

limitation on personal services would become \$2,552,931.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of which not more than a certain amount shall be available for personal services. The Senator from Michigan would not exempt personal services that would be helpful to the States, would be?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. My amendment does not touch those in the States, because they are under a grant which the State or the private institution actually spends, and it is not limited in this bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Nevertheless, the Public Health Service has to have supervisory personnel in order properly to administer the contribution for aid to the States.

Mr. FERGUSON. There would be more than 600 positions for that purpose. For just the supervisory part of the work with reference to the grants, according

to the House figures, there were 678 permanent positions. The average employment is 663. Those are only Federal positions, covered by the limitation of \$2,000,000 plus. The \$19,000,000, less the \$2,000,000, would not be touched at all. We are touching only the supervisory employees.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator whether he does not think his position is inconsistent? He says he is willing to make grants in full, and without deduction, to the States, some of which have fine public-health services, some of which are mediocre, and some of which are downright poor, when he seeks to cut from the Federal grant money for services which are performed in directing the State services, without which the States would have great difficulties.

services which provide research work which none of the States can carry on, and on which the progress of research throughout the country is largely based. That would seem to me to be a completely and thoroughly inconsistent position.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan does not feel that he is inconsistent at all. I hope the time has not come when the Congress feels that when the United States Government makes a grant to a university, a hospital, a clinic, or a private institution for research, we are going to determine every move that particular institution shall make in the spending of the money. If we do that, we shall have absolute Federal control, and the Senator from Michigan is not in favor of that. I believe that if the Government of the United States is going to conduct research, the research will not come out of marble halls built by the Federal Government. If research work is to be carried on, it will be conducted by the great host of fine research men all over the Nation who are doing such work not only in lofts, barns, small college buildings, and other buildings, but who are working on their own. It is for that reason that the Senator from Michigan felt he was not affecting anything except the supervisory power in Washington. I take it for granted that there is no appropriation for personnel involving 600 or 700 persons that cannot be cut by 10 percent without doing good rather than harm.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall yield in a moment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Those are noble words uttered by the Senator from Michigan. I do not want any Federal agency or the representatives of any Federal agency interfering with State work. But when we appropriate millions of dollars I do want to have someone in the individual States to see that those millions are spent for the purpose for which they were appropriated. When we make grants of money available to the State of Michigan or to the State of New Mexico, for instance, there should be some agency of the Federal Government to see that the money is being properly expended. I do not want the Federal Government to interfere with Pennsylvania, Michigan, New Mexico, Delaware, or any other States as to how roads should be built, but I do want some agency of the Federal Government to watch the appropriation of \$500,000,000 a year and see that it is spent for roads. In this instance all I would want personnel to do would be to see that the money which is contributed to the State of New Mexico or to the State of Michigan for mental research, cancer research, or heart research, is spent for that purpose and nothing else.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will reply to that by saying that there is a congressional agency, the General Accounting Office, whose

duty it is to see that money appropriated is spent according to law. The Senator from Michigan feels as does the Senator from New Mexico, except that the Senator from Michigan thinks the cut should be 10 percent and the Senator from New Mexico feels that it should be 5 percent in personal services of Federal employees covered by these appropriations.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to my colleague from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Is it the Senator's contention that there are too many employees provided for the supervisory work?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; it is my contention that the budget calls for 10 percent too many, that we can get along with 90 percent of the budget figure.

Mr. MOODY. Then why not reduce the number of personnel by 10 percent?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what we are trying to do.

Mr. MOODY. The Senator is trying to reduce the amount of the appropriation by 10 percent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. MOODY. Why not cut down the number of employees?

Mr. FERGUSON. Because it has been indicated that we cannot cut the number of employees in just that way. We tried to do just that through the Jensen amendment, and I supported that proposal, but the committee would not have any part of that.

Mr. MOODY. The committee is probably well advised in that stand, but I believe what is proposed by the Senator is the wrong approach.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HUNT. I wonder if the Senator is aware of the fact that of the 653 supervisory employees of whom he spoke, only 15 percent are really engaged in supervisory work, and that the others are engaged in research work. I want to say to the Senator from Michigan that by reducing, as he purports to do, the small supervisory personnel, he is directly or indirectly, and without a question of a doubt, affecting the health service of every State in the Union. There is one particular item about which I do know. The people of this country every year expend \$2,000,000,000 for dental services. I say to the Senator that only one-tenth of 1 percent of \$2,000,000,000 is spent in dental research. The Senator wants to reduce that amount, and that is not good procedure from the standpoint of the health of the Nation. I should like very much to see the Senate accept the amendment offered by the Senator from New York or an amendment which would entirely except all health services.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield in a moment.

I desire to reply to the statement just made by saying that I realize what a great appeal is presented by a health program. Every one of the health programs appeals to the Senator from Mich-

igan. After all, no substitute can be found by way of dollars or anything else for the health of the people. But the question is, Can we not have efficient programs of this character and at the same time make cuts in some of the payrolls of the United States Government?

Mr. President, the latest figure with respect to civilian employees on the payroll of the United States Government is for April 30, 1951. The number is 2,409,121. That is an increase of 440,721 from the July 1, 1950, figure. In other words, Government employment has risen at an average rate of 44,000 persons a month in this fiscal year. That is not the end by any means. The Bureau of the Budget estimates that an additional 400,000 will be added in the next fiscal year.

Mr. President, the committee recognized that there should be a cut in this item, and they cut it 5 percent. The Senator from Michigan and those who have joined him in sponsoring the amendment, as well as other Senators on the floor, think it can be cut 10 percent without doing any harm to the service, but, to the contrary, in many cases improving the service.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will yield to the Senator from New York in a moment. I yield first to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It was pointed out to the Senator from Michigan that care should be taken not to injure any of the health programs. I wonder if it is not about time the Congress should think about the health of the American taxpayers.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator has made a very good point. I believe a great many individuals can be relieved of heart trouble by cutting down on their tax bills. Let us start here in the Senate of the United States a research bureau on that subject. I believe we could afford relief to many suffering from bad hearts. I know that any person who must pay the amount of tax he now is obliged to pay worries about it. We can eliminate many cases of ulcers and heart trouble by cutting the budget and thereby cutting the size of the tax bill.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Michigan stated that there were in the employ of the Federal Government somewhat more than 2,400,000 persons.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was wondering whether the Senator had a breakdown of the figures, and could tell me how many of those were employed directly in the health activities of the Federal Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Michigan will yield, I think I can give the Senator from New York the figures.

Mr. FERGUSON. I can give the figures for the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I am talking about the health activities of the Federal Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not have a further breakdown available before me.

Mr. LEHMAN. My amendment does not cover the Federal Security Agency. It covers purely health activities, and the number engaged is a relatively small number.

Mr. FERGUSON. Compared to the whole number in the Federal Security Agency, yes.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. With reference to the point raised by the Senator from New York, I have the figures as to the employees in the Department of Labor. In March 1949 the number was 3,537. During 1949 the number was increased about 50 percent. In 1950 the increase was 16 percent. There has been a graduated increase in 1951, all the way through. The increase cannot be laid to the war. The largest increase was before the war.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to illustrate the sort of thing we are striking at. The Federal Security Agency has in Washington 37 full-time chauffeurs. It has more full-time chauffeurs than any other agency in the District of Columbia. In the field it has 7 full-time chauffeurs. That makes a total of 44.

Then it has a number of part-time chauffeurs, and other employees who serve as part-time drivers. It has 13 in the District area. In the field it has 87. That makes a total of 100.

The Senator from Michigan, on behalf of himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], will send to the desk later an amendment to eliminate all such employees. It provides that—

No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government, whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus), and any funds appropriated in this act for any such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. We have here a bill appropriating more than \$2,000,000,000. The committee has made certain cuts. Some Senators are talking about the danger of sabotaging various departments. I wish to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. How much money will be saved by the Cordon amendment and the amendment which the Senator from Michigan has offered on behalf of himself and other Senators, if those amendments are adopted?

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amount that will be saved will be \$11,731,339 out of \$117,313,484. In other words, we were asked to appropriate \$117,313,484 for personal services and we would cut that amount by \$11,731,339.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the total cut?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; that is the total cut, \$11,000,000-plus.

Mr. WHERRY. Does that not include also the cut made by the committee?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. The committee has cut just half that amount, including its independent cuts plus application of the 5-percent formula.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the committee cut represents less than half—5 percent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Five percent is half of 10 percent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But we did not go as far as the Senator from Michigan proposes to go.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the point I want to make is that the figure stated includes the committee cut. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. I went along with the cuts proposed by the committee. I am glad to see Senators on the other side of the aisle, including the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], join with those of us who have been fighting for 8 or 9 years to make cuts in appropriations. When on the floor of the Senate we are endeavoring to make a 10-percent cut, which is a cut of 5 percent in addition to the cut made by the committee, the argument is made that it will result in sabotaging certain functions. I point out to the Members of the Senate that out of an appropriation bill of more than \$2,000,000,000 the Cordon amendment would make a cut of about \$1,700,000, and with the additional cut—

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have the floor. Permit me to finish.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know the Senator wants to be fair about this matter and would be glad to have factual information.

Mr. WHERRY. I asked the distinguished Senator from Michigan for factual information.

Mr. FERGUSON. And I have yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly the Senator yielded to me. I am asking for factual information. The argument is being made that what we propose to do will result in sabotaging various functions. If I have the figures correctly, the proposed 10-percent cut would represent about a \$11,700,000 cut below budget estimates. I may be wrong, and if so, I wish some Senator would correct me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, just a moment please. I still have the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Oh, yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Out of over \$2,000,000,000, the complete over-all cut, including the committee's cut, is \$11,700,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is not correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask for order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor and has yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. It is very well for the Senator from New Mexico to say that something is not correct, but he can do so in his own time and not in mine.

Mr. President, I am not posing as an authority. Many misstatements have been made this afternoon, and I am trying to obtain the facts. I am asking a very simple question. We are told that if we cut these appropriations we

shall be sabotaging all these activities. My point is that the total cuts proposed by the committee in the Cordon amendment, and the cut proposed by the Senator from Michigan, would not amount to a great deal out of a total appropriation of over \$2,000,000,000. Does the Senator from Michigan know how much the total cut would be?

Mr. FERGUSON. Eleven million seven hundred thousand dollars, for personal services.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the cut which would be made by the committee by the Cordon amendment, plus what is sought by the pending amendment. If that is the figure—and I shall be glad to have any correction made—

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the figure.

Mr. WHERRY. I say that it is a very small cut from a \$2,000,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The difficulty is that the Senator from Nebraska is using the total appropriation figure of \$2,528,338,381. That is the total appropriation. More than \$2,000,000,000 of that amount does not come out of the general treasury. It comes from the employers and the employees. What the Senator from Nebraska has in mind in connection with the \$11,000,000 reduction is personal services. Personal services amount to only \$117,000,000. It is proposed to save \$11,000,000, not out of two-billion-odd dollars, but out of \$117,000,000. That is why I stated to the Senator from Nebraska that he was incorrect when he stated that the saving was \$11,000,000 out of \$2,528,338,381. The saving comes out of \$117,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, I am talking about personal services, and administrative costs in connection with a \$2,000,000,000 appropriation bill. That is exactly correct. I agree completely with the figures which have been cited. That is exactly what I said. The item for personal services amounts to \$117,000,000. That amount of personal services is required to administer the authorizations which have been made. In connection with the \$2,000,000,000 appropriation bill there is an administrative cost of \$117,000,000. Considering the amount which the committee has already cut, and what the Cordon amendment would cut from the bill, if those cuts are adopted—and they have been, unless they are amended in some respect—by the addition of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, there would be a saving of \$11,700,000. I say that that is a very small amount to be arguing about when we are trying to make a saving in the Federal budget. We are not going to sabotage all the various offices which are being discussed.

The other day I was at the Pentagon Building. It is too bad that we cannot reach into the military appropriations to effect savings. Think of the departments which are not even touched by these bills. For 8 or 9 years I have passed the Pentagon Building morning

and evening. Every available parking space has an automobile in it. Last year we made an appropriation for another huge parking lot, which has just been completed. There are automobiles parked from the little tea house to Highway No. 1, on both sides of the road. One can hardly get through the parked automobiles. There are more automobiles there than were ever parked there at the peak of World War II. Yet every time a cut is suggested, it is said that not one person in the whole Government can be sacrificed. It is said that we are sabotaging this or that activity.

I was in another agency of the Government yesterday trying to have an order clarified. Lawyers are walking all over each other, interpreting laws which Congress has enacted, and with respect to which their interpretations are in direct contradiction of the intent of Congress. That accounts for about nine-tenths of our troubles. If some of the men in the departments would accept the interpretation of Congress, we would not have lawyers three deep interpreting the laws in direct contradiction of the intent of Congress. I could name more than one agency which is doing that. I could name agencies which have their men here lobbying even on the floor of the Senate, for the repeal or change of legislation which Congress has enacted. What the law reads is one thing; what the bureaus want is another.

The argument that we cannot eliminate some of those men from the payroll is a worn-out argument. The same argument was made before the committee. It is now being made on the floor of the Senate. It is said that if one person is cut off, efficiency in the Government is sacrificed. I could not operate my business the way some of the departments in Washington are conducted. It would bankrupt me. If we want efficiency in government, let us eliminate some unnecessary expenditures. Instead of adding every year, let us begin to subtract, and see where we come out. Let us see what departments cannot operate as efficiently with smaller appropriations.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Nebraska to answer the question.

Mr. FREAR. Did the Senator from Nebraska vote for the appropriation to increase the parking space at the Pentagon?

Mr. WHERRY. I have voted for every defense bill which has come before the Senate. I have tried to make some cuts. I should not be a bit surprised if I voted for the particular measure to which the Senator from Delaware refers. The first thing we hear, if we try to eliminate a defense item is, "You cannot do that. That would affect the war effort." I am just as much interested as anyone else in national defense. However, we could do some pruning of defense items and still have a better Defense Department than we now have. I am not sure whether I voted for the particular appropriation to which the Senator refers. I suppose I

did. I have gone right along supporting the defense agencies because we want to protect the national security and our boys in uniform. However, we could do a job of pruning on defense items if we only dared to do it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me in order that I may reply to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. WHERRY. I am not asking for any Senator to reply to me.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask a question?

Mr. WHERRY. I shall be glad to listen to the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Nebraska seems to be under the impression that I am advocating a change in connection with all the expenditures in the budget. He talks about \$2,000,000,000. As a matter of fact, all I am talking about is the cut in the services which affect the public health. I believe that the aggregate amount for personal services in this connection is \$117,000,000. The cut applies only to personal services. It does not apply to any administrative expenses or anything of that sort.

Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan one further question—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me in order that I may respond to the Senator from New York?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate what the Senator from New York is trying to do. No Member of this body is more interested in helping cancer and heart research than is the Senator from Nebraska. Long before the Senator from New York came to the Senate the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Nebraska were fighting for these particular things. I am interested in public health. No one—not even the Senator from New York—has a corner on promoting public health in the United States Senate. We are all trying to do the best we can. But we must try to see where we can help to balance the budget. We cannot say that any one department is sacrosanct. We must do the best we can.

Mr. LEHMAN. Even where life is concerned?

Mr. WHERRY. Life is involved in connection with defense, too. This particular amendment does not affect the money which goes to the States. It affects only personnel in Washington. The idea advanced by the Senator from New York is that if we do not have proper supervision, the programs in the States will be adversely affected. There may be some truth to that contention; I do not know, but my judgment is that we now have all the supervision we need. We have too much of it. What we should do is to let some of the local communities do something once in a while. They will probably do just as well as the bureaucrats in Washington.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Nebraska has to say. I wish to compliment the Senator from Nebraska, because I believe he is big enough to admit on the floor of the Senate that he voted for certain appropriations. However, to get back to the proposed 5-percent cut in personnel in the Washington offices, I am amazed that we are stopping at 5 percent. I believe that if we made a tabulation of personnel in this city, perhaps we could eliminate many more than 5 percent. I think it would be found that the employees belong to both political parties. Therefore, I do not know that we can carry on the discussion on a political basis. It would apply to both sides, perhaps predominantly to the Senator's side of the aisle. I believe we could increase efficiency by reducing personnel 10 percent. I am not condemning the Senator. I merely wished to give praise where I thought it was due.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Michigan moved in committee to make the reduction 10 percent, instead of 5 percent, and had considerable support, but the 5-percent formula prevailed. Some of us who think that 5 percent is not a sufficient cut-back in personal services have proposed the pending amendment. It merely repeats the committee process, to arrive at a reduction of personal services in the amount of 10 percent, but it does so in a single package, rather than item by item.

Mr. President, by looking at the budget, it may be possible to explain how it is broken down. I take, for example, the Federal Security Agency figures, which are shown at page 213 of the budget document:

Personal services:

Permanent positions, 1952 estimate, \$1,-479,724.

Part-time and temporary positions, \$52,-905.

Regular pay in excess of 52-week base, \$5,572.

Payment above basic rates, \$4,850.

Total personal services, \$1,543,051.

Deduct charges for quarters.

Net personal services, \$1,540,351.

Then are shown items for travel, transportation of things, communication services, rents, and utility services, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, supplies and materials, equipment, and so forth. The total of such items is \$10,150,000. The figure of \$10,150,000 would not be touched by the pending amendment.

I am aware that there are those who like to defend against any appropriation cuts by contending this is a meat-axe approach. It is not. To any who may want to make such a contention I will say that I could offer amendments to the same effect on each of the 47 appropriation items in this bill which are affected. That is pin-pointing the cuts. It is precisely what the committee did to the

extent of 5 percent. But it will accomplish nothing more than this single-package reduction. The result will be the same but I and the Senate will be spared the labor of considering 47 separate amendments. Mindful of the complaints registered on the floor yesterday by the Senator from New Mexico and others about consuming the Senate's time, I feel this over-all approach should be most acceptable.

Mr. President, if one bill before Congress demands the time and attention of committees and of all Senators on the floor, it is an appropriation bill. Appropriation bills are no more and no less than the taking of taxpayers' money, depositing it in a bank, and allowing the executive branch of the Government, the legislative branch of the Government, and the judicial branch of the Government, to draw checks against it. That is all it amounts to. We must remember that it is taxpayers' money, and why should we not take considerable time to discuss the amount we will deposit in the bank, to be drawn against by Government officials to pay for the operation of the Government?

For the benefit of those who wish to see how this amendment will affect the individual items I have submitted a table in the RECORD, which is a composite of the various individual amendments which could be made to give the same result as this single amendment. This composite shows the potential amend-

ment number, a description of the appropriation item, the page and line number of the items, the principal appropriation item to be stricken, the figure to be substituted, the personal service limitation to be stricken, and the dollar figure to be substituted.

Why is it that we are so insistent upon a 10-percent reduction in personal services as against a 5-percent reduction?

Simply because every person here, and throughout the country, knows that there is no reason whatsoever in the swollen and padded Government payrolls which now confront us. They are a part and parcel of a really terrifying graph which appeared on the front page of one of our papers the other day, showing that governmental expenditures are actually increasing faster than the national income.

Let me give some statistics on Government employment. The latest civilian employment figure is for April 30 and is 2,409,121. That is an increase of 440,721 from the July 1, 1950, figure. In other words, Government employment has been rising at an average rate of 44,000 a month. And that is not the end by any means. The Bureau of the Budget estimates that an additional 400,000 will be added in the next fiscal year.

Even with those additions we will not have reached the peak of civilian employment which was hit during the war, in July of 1945. But here is a figure of tremendous importance. The rate of annual expenditures for personal services

right now is in excess of \$8,300,000,000, and \$8,300,000,000 was the all-time peak for Government salaries reached in fiscal year 1945. Just project that payroll amount, with the personnel additions and the salary increases which are in prospect, and it is clearly evident where we are heading. It is likewise clear why we must act now, with this amendment, to stop this trend.

In connection with these employment statistics there is available for the RECORD a comparative table of the employment records in the agencies covered by the pending bill. Agency by agency this table includes average and permanent employment of personnel requested by the President for 1952, a comparison of the number of persons on the rolls in April 1950 and April 1951, and their salary expense, together with a month-by-month record of employment and payroll cost for the current fiscal year through April, which is the last report available.

The data demonstrate graphically the trend which is in existence, part of it under the guise of defense necessity, but always in the direction of greater and greater Federal activity and entrenched bureaucracy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Employment record of agencies for which appropriations are made in H. R. 3709

[NOTE.—Actual money payroll figures lag behind personnel figures 1 month. For this reason March payroll figures are used as estimates in all figures for April]

	Proposed in budget for fiscal year 1952		Actual (head count) employment and payroll costs (in thousands of dollars)												
	Employees		Payroll	April 1951		April 1950		July 1950		August 1950		September 1950		October 1950	
	Perma- nent	Aver- age		Person- nel	Pay	Person- nel	Pay	Person- nel	Pay	Person- nel	Pay	Person- nel	Pay	Person- nel	Pay
Department of Labor.....	5,935	6,122	\$26,974,305	8,136	\$2,571	6,016	\$1,681	6,033	\$1,993	6,070	\$2,035	6,151	\$2,063	6,324	\$2,308
Federal Security Agency.....	39,522	38,465	148,137,281	35,435	10,582	33,981	9,127	32,970	9,051	33,048	10,206	33,676	9,222	34,325	10,003
National Labor Relations Board.....	1,471	1,466	6,970,825	1,529	598	1,530	519	1,362	504	1,356	549	1,395	518	1,429	550
National Mediation Board.....	113	125	920,085	117	73	123	64	128	66	129	63	124	76	120	62
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,360	2,378	8,807,104	2,071	662	2,287	656	2,297	674	2,240	625	2,200	663	2,158	677
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	445	408	2,726,740	355	195	337	172	327	178	326	194	324	181	326	177
Total.....	49,846	48,964	194,536,340	47,643	14,681	44,274	12,219	43,117	12,466	43,166	13,672	43,870	12,723	44,682	13,777

	Actual (head count) employment and payroll costs (in thousands of dollars)—Continued												Total pay- roll costs first 10 months, fiscal year 1951
	November 1950		December 1950		January 1951		February 1951		March 1951		April 1951		
	Person- nel	Pay	Person- nel	Pay	Person- nel	Pay	Person- nel	Pay	Person- nel	Pay	Person- nel	Pay	
Department of Labor.....	6,473	\$2,216	6,430	\$2,211	6,941	\$2,439	7,585	\$2,284	7,656	\$2,571	8,136	\$2,571	\$22,694,000
Federal Security Agency.....	34,865	10,187	34,891	9,412	35,295	10,770	34,844	9,498	35,107	10,582	35,435	10,582	99,513,000
National Labor Relations Board.....	1,487	576	1,557	534	1,451	589	1,450	521	1,576	598	1,529	598	5,537,000
National Mediation Board.....	114	69	113	62	117	62	120	55	119	73	117	73	661,000
Railroad Retirement Board.....	2,126	666	2,117	632	2,096	695	2,069	600	2,081	662	2,071	662	6,546,000
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	328	185	333	186	333	202	345	176	356	195	355	195	1,869,000
Total.....	45,393	13,899	45,441	13,037	46,233	14,757	46,413	13,134	46,895	14,681	47,643	14,681	136,827,000

¹ Includes funds from public sources such as fees, tuitions, etc.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, when one sits on the Appropriations Committee he realizes that under the guise of defense activities, activities in connection with the Defense Production Act, and so forth, we are permitting employees to go from the regular agencies into swollen

wartime agencies, not in connection with regular promotions, but by means of jumping their promotions and obtaining larger salaries. This causes additional expenses in two ways. In the agencies to which they go, they have had no training whatever and that is expensive.

When they take positions at higher grades and higher salaries, that also causes their former positions to be filled by new employees who have had no training whatever in them.

Mr. President, Senators who have not carefully examined that situation can-

not realize what is going on in the Government under the guise of defense. They cannot realize the amount of money that is being taken from the taxpayers, the amount of money that will have to be included in the next appropriation bill, because of that situation. If those amounts could be broken down to show what each family in the Nation will have to pay because of this situation, the protests which would be made by the people generally would be so vociferous that Congress would not permit Government officials or employees to be removed from one agency, in the work of which they have been trained, to another agency, at higher salaries, although they do not know anything about their new work and must be trained for it. Furthermore, when such transfers are made, it is necessary to obtain new employees for the positions such persons formerly occupied, and to train those new employees for that work.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to make a brief comment, with the indulgence of the Senator from Michigan. Although I do not agree that what he is now suggesting in the way of a cut is correct, nevertheless I do agree fully with the last statement he has made. It is true that many of the employees of the Government who have been trained to do particular types of work in the regular departments are now being transferred to the new Government agencies, generally at an increase of two or three or four numbers in grade under the Classification Act. I wish we could reach that situation. Even in connection with this bill, we had at the hearings information that some agencies are losing employees who have been with them for years, because the employees can transfer to new departments or agencies at higher grades which have no classification whatsoever. I agree with the Senator as to that situation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator. I know that he has tried, as have other members of the Appropriations Committee, to reach this situation. We have ordered the agencies to furnish the committee information as to the numbers of such transferring employees, their names, and their changes in grade, so that we could see exactly what was occurring in this respect in each agency.

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will adopt this amendment, which calls for a 10-percent cut in the appropriations for personnel, rather than the 5-percent cut recommended by the committee. It will be a tremendous step toward cutting back on the intolerable burden of non-essential Government employment.

I want to stress just one thing more. This is the first appropriation bill for 1952. What we do here on this bill is going to create the precedent and set the pattern for our action on the 1952 budget. I am absolutely confident the

people of this country are looking to us to reduce the overload of Federal employees provided for in the budget for 1952 by at least 10 percent. That is the purpose and effect of this amendment. We should not miss this opportunity to set the pace for consideration of the whole 1952 budget.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, I submit the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of Mr. FERGUSON's amendment, it is proposed to change the colon to a period and insert the following: "Provided, That this section shall not apply to appropriations of the Public Health Service for hospitals and medical care, foreign quarantine service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, mental-health activities, National Heart Institute, and dental-health activities."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the amendment of the Senator from New York to my amendment in order, or is it an amendment in the third degree?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is an amendment in the second degree, and at this stage of the proceedings it is in order. An amendment in the third degree would not be in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. So, the amendment of the Senator from New York to my amendment is an amendment in the second degree?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have been in the Senate for quite a long time. I do not think I was ever legislatively more embarrassed or personally more embarrassed than I am at this moment. I am devoted to my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and I believe he is devoted to me. He is a wonderful man and a staunch friend of mine.

However, when this matter came up before the full committee, I reached the conclusion that the so-called cuts which were proposed to be made in the bill by the subcommittee were entirely too small. When the Senator from Michigan first offered his amendment calling for a 10-percent cut, I voted in favor of it. Then I pleaded with the committee—I did not simply ask the committee, but I pleaded with the committee, with all the fervor at my command—"For heaven's sake, let us cut down the appropriations carried in this bill. This bill carries entirely too much money under the circumstances in which we are now situated." Nevertheless, the amendment of the Senator from Michigan was rejected in the committee by a vote of 4 to 8. I was one of the four Senators voting in the committee in favor of the amendment.

I then was so anxious to accomplish some savings that I submitted an amend-

ment calling for a 7-percent reduction—just 7 percent. That amendment was rejected by a vote of 6 to 7.

Finally the amendment calling for a 5-percent reduction was submitted, and I voted for it, rather than not to have any cut made. The reduction we shall achieve by adopting the 5-percent amendment will be precious little, as I understand the amendment.

Incidentally, Mr. President, let me say also that the 10-percent reduction amendment proposed in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill will, in my opinion, constitute precious little reduction. I do not believe the Senator from Michigan was present when the committee was considering that bill and that amendment to it; but I know I offered the amendment, and it was rejected by a vote of 3 to 5. I then offered an amendment calling for a 7-percent reduction, but it was rejected by a vote of 4 to 5.

I then voted—reluctantly—for the amendment calling for a 5-percent reduction, even though I did not think that amendment would amount to very much, and I still do not think so. I doubt very much whether such a reduction will represent a serious reduction at all. I may be mistaken about that, for I am not particularly good at figures. However, that reduction seems to me to amount to so little that I wish to make this statement to my Democratic friends: At this time, when our country is at war, when we do not know what will occur, when we have been urged by everyone to cut nonmilitary expenditures, when we have to appropriate so much money for the war, for heaven's sake let us cut the nonmilitary expenditures as much as we possibly can. I do not believe it will hurt the Government departments if we adopt this amendment.

Mr. President, in the committee I asked and obtained unanimous consent to vote against the committee amendments. That consent was graciously given, and I shall vote in that way.

Mr. President, if I know my own conscience, if I know my own heart, if I know anything about this Government, and if I know anything about the people of this country, I think it is my bounden duty in these closing years of my life to vote to make reductions in these appropriations. They should be reduced.

I appeal to my Democratic friends to look solely to the interests of their country, which we all love so well, which I know they love as well as I do. But in this time of emergency, in this time when we need money to provide for the defense of this great country, and the defense of our way of life, I appeal to Senators to let us reduce the amount appropriated in the bill, and let us come to an agreement on it.

Let us agree to the pending amendment. I earnestly and sincerely hope that my friends will join with me in voting in favor of the amendment. I favored it in committee. It is exceedingly embarrassing to me, as chairman of the committee, as Senators may realize, to be voted down so often though by a close vote; but I was voted down. My friends

on the committee voted me down. I hope they will reconsider, and will vote for the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. AIKEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am most happy that the chairman of the committee [Mr. McKELLAR] rose to explain his position. It was not necessary for him to do so. We who have been associated with him here for many years know that the Senator from Tennessee, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is recognized for his devotion, his loyalty, and his patriotism. It was unnecessary for him to explain his vote, but the Senator from Tennessee conscientiously thought the cut should have been 10 percent and there was not a single member who would even dare have in mind the questioning of his motives or of his integrity in coming to that decision.

The other members of the full committee and of the subcommittee decided that possibly a 10-percent cut would be a little too drastic. We know that this body has a right to overrule the subcommittee, or to overrule the full committee, and the question is clear as to the issue upon which the Senate is to vote. The committee has recommended a cut of 5 percent in the money items for personal services. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan, of which my good friend from Tennessee approves, is to the effect that the cut should be 10 percent instead of 5 percent. So the issue is clear. I believe that the proponent of the 5-percent cut would desire, as I understand, during the afternoon, to explain the position which he took in favor of the 5-percent cut. But, after that, and notwithstanding that, I might have to oppose the position of the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Tennessee. It would be one of the few times that I know of that I have ever taken a position contrary to that of the Senator from Tennessee. I should like to have the Senate come to a conclusion. The cut is to be either 5 percent or 10 percent. The Senate is supreme in these matters.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The President is very anxious that four members of the Committee on Banking and Currency confer with him and Mr. Wilson at 4 o'clock. Several members of the committee whom he invited to attend the conference are unwilling to go, if to do so would mean missing the vote on the pending amendment. Would it be possible for the debate to continue, say, until 4:30? I think we could return by that time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know whether it will continue until that hour or not. My opinion is that the debate will possibly continue until 4:30. My understanding is that the proponent of the amendment calling for a 5-percent cut is to discuss the reasons for the amendment. I do not know how much time

he desires. There may be other Senators who want to discuss it.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of making a unanimous-consent request to fix the time for the vote?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. In event the Senators have not returned from the White House by the time the debate is concluded, would the Senator be willing that the vote go over—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Until 4:30?

Mr. McFARLAND. Until another day?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, no.

Mr. ROBERTSON. The defense production bill is a rather essential bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I appreciate that. Let me ask the distinguished majority leader whether it is proposed to have a session of the Senate tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; it was not thought that we would have a session tomorrow. The committees have been very busy and I had thought the Senate might recess until Monday. But it was my thought that we might get an agreement for a limitation of debate starting Monday.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it possible for us to arrive at a decision as to when we will vote upon this particular amendment?

Mr. CAPEHART. I suggest 5 o'clock.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote!

Mr. McFARLAND and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield first to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall endeavor to protect the interests of the Senators referred to by the Senator from Virginia. If they will proceed to keep their appointment, I shall ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico to bear with me while I endeavor to work out an agreement to vote on Monday, in the event Senators are unable to return in time to have the vote this evening.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would rather get an agreement as to the time for voting on this particular amendment, which, to my mind, is the final amendment to the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I think there will be no difficulty about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield the floor?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the conference at the White House is very important. I took the responsibility of telling the Senators who were called to the White House that I would try to see to it that we did not come to a vote in

their absence. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning next Monday at 12 o'clock, the debate be limited to 2 hours, 1 hour on a side, the time to be divided equally, and controlled by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

I should like to ask the Senator from New York how much time he will want on Monday on his amendment. I was propounding a unanimous-consent request that the Senate limit the debate on Monday to 1 hour on a side. Then I thought about the Senator's amendment, and I should like to know how much time he would like to take.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should want about 10 or 15 minutes, but other Senators may wish to speak on other phases of medical activities. I am speaking only on mental health.

Mr. McFARLAND. With reference to any amendments to the amendment, I ask that the time be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair feels that the Senate can make a great deal more time if Senators will resume their seats. To whom does the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I think I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I should like to restate the unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that, beginning next Monday at 12 o'clock, the debate be limited to 2 hours, to be divided equally between the two sides, and controlled by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and that on any amendments to the amendment 30 minutes be allowed, to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from New Mexico, and if the Senator from New Mexico shall be in favor of the amendment, then between the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from Michigan, or some Senator whom he may designate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire about germane amendments. We want it kept open so that any Senator who wants to offer an amendment can do so up to the time the bill is passed.

Mr. McFARLAND. This request applies only to this one amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I have no objection to that at all.

Mr. LEHMAN. Reserving the right to object, I wish to make a suggestion to the majority leader. Without proposing any change in the unanimous-consent request which has been made by the Senator from Arizona, I should like the

right to read some brief remarks into the Record this afternoon.

Mr. McFARLAND. Oh, certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Arizona if it is his intention to suspend discussion and action upon this bill this afternoon.

Mr. McFARLAND. I did not want to suspend so long as any Senator desires to discuss it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator meant to suspend further voting; did he?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes, because of the conference at the White House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask how many Senators were invited to the conference?

Mr. McFARLAND. Four or more. It is an important conference on important legislative matters. Some Senators said they would not attend if a vote was to be taken. I thought, in view of the lateness of the hour—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think we have some hours left in which to work on the pending bill. Apparently the Senators attending the conference will be back by 5 o'clock. I shall, reluctantly, be compelled to object.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. May I inquire whether the pending amendment is the Ferguson amendment or the Lehman amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois that it is difficult to resist or to refuse an invitation to go to the White House because, after all, regardless of political affiliations, it is a bipartisan proposition, I hope. I was not invited, but several other Senators have been invited. They had either to refuse the invitation or to pass up opportunity to vote on the amendment. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that the work of the Senate comes first, but in this particular case—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should think we could vote at 5 o'clock on this amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall do my best to protect Senators. If they do not return in time, I shall move a recess of the Senate.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For the information of the majority leader, there are only four Senators involved. I agreed to pair with one of them. He is satisfied. That leaves three. With all the talk about getting appropriation bills passed, I think we should proceed and get the pending bill out of the way tonight.

Mr. WHERRY. I am absolutely in favor of getting bills passed, but there are Senators who would like very much to be recorded on the vote on the pending amendment, and I do not blame them at all.

Mr. MAGNUSON. They will be back at 5 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. I cannot tell about that. They were invited to go to the White House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection has been made.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield in order that I may submit an amendment?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and myself and ask that it lie on the desk and be printed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it an amendment to the bill, or to the Senator's pending amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is an amendment to the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is amendment in addition to the one which is already before the Senate?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is an amendment which I mentioned during my remarks with reference to prohibiting the use of funds authorized for chauffeurs and drivers of automobiles owned by various agencies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and lie on the table.

MENTAL HEALTH

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment which I have offered to the amendment of the senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, during the 14 years when I was lieutenant governor and governor of my State, no matter concerned me or engaged my attention more fully and at greater length than did the subject of mental health.

Our needs in all areas of medical research are great. In none, however, can we honestly say that the needs are greater than in the field of mental health. Measured in any way you like—in terms of lost military manpower, in terms of lost wages and productivity, in terms of accidents, suicides, crime and divorce, in terms of human anguish, and in terms of cold dollars and cents, the cost of mental and emotional illness is staggering.

In the course of normal living today, 1 person out of every 20 can expect to spend at least part of his or her life in a mental hospital. Consider what this fact means, not only to these unhappy people, but also to their families, and their friends.

Today, this is the story told by cold statistics that have long been on public record:

First. At least half of our Nation's hospital beds are devoted to care of the mentally ill.

Second. State mental hospitals cost the taxpayers about \$400,000,000 annually.

Third. Federal mental hospital care, including the huge obligation of caring for mentally ill veterans, costs us some \$500,000,000 annually.

Here are some more facts. As we all know, our mental hospitals are severely overcrowded. We have never been able to build enough to take care of the total need, and in almost every State there are waiting lists of persons who need psy-

chiatric care in an institution but who must wait their turn, sometimes in jails, sometimes in hospitals which need the space for care of people with acute physical illness, and sometimes in the care of their families, imposing a terrible emotional, financial, and physical burden.

But the problem is greater than the number in mental hospitals or needing mental hospital care. Altogether, I have been informed, at least 9,000,000 persons suffer from mental illness or disability to such an extent that they require proper psychiatric aid.

What is the answer? Should we build more hospitals and train more psychiatrists?

Certainly. We cannot ignore this great need.

But more hospitals cannot solve our problem. As a well-known psychiatrist recently pointed out, if 1 out of every 20 automobiles that came off the assembly line in Detroit proved defective, broke down on the highway, endangering and possibly killing its occupants, there would be no question of what to do. The automobile industry would not only provide for repair of such failures, it would seek the source of the trouble, learn what was going wrong with the cars, and find out how such breakdowns could be prevented.

Thus, we cannot be content with attempts to salvage and repair our emotional failures. We must seek out the roots of the trouble. We must find out why some people cannot take the normal stresses and strains of living. We must learn why they crack up in the middle of their careers, harming not only themselves but also causing suffering to their wives, husbands, children. We must learn how to strike directly at mental illness.

That is why the Congress passed the National Mental Health Act in 1946, 5 years ago this July. In addition to providing for more psychiatric training and for expanded State mental-health programs, this act provided for a great increase in research. Its mandate has been carried out by the National Institute of Mental Health, which, as Senators know, is one of the national institutes of health.

Results of the National Mental Health Act, to date, have been most encouraging. Before 1946, less than half of the States had mental-health programs. Now every State and Territory has an active and expanding program, which uses research findings for the direct benefit of the American people. Today, too, hundreds of training programs are under way to increase our supply of critically needed specialists in psychiatric professions. Today, research in the field of mental illness has reached a new peak, both in the number of first-class scientific minds devoted to this work and in the funds they have at their disposal for essential equipment and assistance.

Through this research, science has learned more about the treatment of mental illness through surgery. Aided by a series of recent Federal grants, careful and intensive studies of treated

and untreated patients have shown how and when this type of treatment can have its maximum effect. Through the work of the National Institute of Mental Health, new ways have been found to treat drug addicts, greatly aiding our Nation's fight on this growing social problem. New findings have been made on the effects of wartime tensions and family disruption upon young children, facts that will prove valuable as more men go into military service and more mothers enter war industry. These are only a few of the hundreds of projects aided by the funds that Congress appropriates.

The amendment would remove the limitation on personal services carried in the committee bill. At a time when every person who can devote himself to this problem is needed, particularly in research, we should not limit the Surgeon General in his efforts to find the cause, prevention, and cure of mental illnesses by requiring that there be a reduction in the number of scientists and others who are working on these problems. What we should be doing is appropriating more money, rather than forcing a reduction in force.

Mr. President, I have spoken only about the field of mental health. Some of my colleagues, either today or when we meet again next week, will undoubtedly discuss the great problems of heart disease, of cancer, of dental care, and of other fields of health which are so vital to the welfare of our people.

I heard the moving plea of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee a few minutes ago. I share with him the feeling that we should economize on every nonessential activity. The military defense of our country, of course, is paramount. But right alongside military defense, in our effort to throw back aggression, and to bring peace to a war-torn world, comes the fight for the health of our people. I say "right along side of" because the health of our people is, in my opinion, vital to the defense of our Nation.

Mr. President, I recently returned from a great convention held in Geneva, Switzerland. As Senators may recall, I attended that convention representing the Senate of the United States and as a delegate of the United States. It was the fourth assembly of the World Health Organization. I was deeply impressed with the spirit of devotion, the spirit of determination shown by representatives not only of what we consider the enlightened countries, but of countries that have not yet had the advantages and the opportunity of progressing in the manner countries of western civilization have had. Those people are determined to preserve and to advance the health of their people. Certainly I do not think for a moment that we can fail to do as much. I believe that no expense within the means of the American people is too great, if it means the saving of human lives.

We have appropriated countless billions of dollars for the defense of our country, and to help our soldiers, sailors, and airmen fight with as great an assurance as possible of success and safety.

The small amount which would be saved by cutting the personnel in our health services is negligible as compared with the total expenditures which we make every day in the year, and small in comparison to the benefit which would be brought to the American people.

I repeat that I want economy. I shall vote for economy if it does not destroy essential services. Among those essential services I say again that none ranks ahead of the service which will preserve and advance the health of our people.

I very much hope that my amendment to the Ferguson amendment will prevail.

IMPORTATION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES IN CONFLICT WITH DOMESTIC PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAMS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, when the bill (H. R. 1612) to extend the authority of the President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements, was before the Senate on May 21, 22, and 23, the junior Senator from Nebraska had several colloquies with the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia and other Senators regarding the effectiveness of Senate Finance Committee amendments contained in section 8 of H. R. 1612.

That section, as it was reported by the Senate committee, provides that in any case where the Secretary of Agriculture determines and reports to the President and to the Tariff Commission that an emergency condition exists with regard to a perishable agricultural commodity, the Tariff Commission shall make an immediate investigation under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, or under section 7—the escape-clause procedure—of H. R. 1612.

Section 8 further states that the Tariff Commission will determine the facts and make recommendations to the President for such relief as may be appropriate. The President may also take action under section 8, without waiting for Tariff Commission recommendations, if in his judgment the emergency requires such action.

However, Mr. President, neither in section 8—which specifically refers to perishable agricultural commodities—nor in any other section of the reciprocal trade agreements extension legislation, is action by the President made mandatory, when imports threaten domestic production and interfere with price-support and conservation programs.

The junior Senator from Nebraska called this fact to the attention of the senior Senator from Georgia in a discussion on the floor of the Senate on May 23, as shown on page 5854, column 1, of the RECORD of that date.

I ask unanimous consent that that particular portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, my reason for making this statement is that although, with the inclusion in the bill of subparagraph (f) on page 13, I think the committee has gone a long way toward helping to tighten up the bill and to eliminate the abuse of the reciprocal trade agreements provision, to a point

where it would be helpful in affording some protection, yet I have a feeling, based on past experience, that it is still within the hands of the administration to do as they choose.

There is not a mandatory provision in the bill which would finally give the relief asked for, and so long as Mr. Acheson is Secretary of State, and running the economy both on the foreign front and on the domestic front, it is my opinion that we cannot obtain the kind of administration which will protect American industry, American agriculture, and American labor. Although I want to compliment the distinguished Senator from Georgia, and also the distinguished ranking minority member, the Senator from Colorado, upon the work they have done to help tighten the present act, my opinion is, nevertheless, that if we are to get protection, we must get it through legislation, not through dependence upon the Secretary of State to administer the laws which Congress writes for him to administer.

Mr. WHERRY. The discussion referred particularly to the invocation of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, provided for in section 8 (a) of H. R. 1612, as a procedure to be followed by the Tariff Commission in investigation of imports endangering domestic, price-supported production.

The senior Senator from Georgia was of the opinion, as shown on page 5636, column 2 of the May 21 RECORD, that by invocation of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act a "mandatory requirement is placed upon the President."

I ask unanimous consent that the observation found on that page be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. GEORGE. Section 22 requires the President to act. I believe if the Senator will read section 22 he will see that the fullest power is there given, and that a direct and mandatory requirement is placed upon the President. At least that is my understanding of it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in a further colloquy on May 22, on page 5736, column 3 of the May 22 RECORD, the senior Senator from Georgia clarified the reference to section 22, by saying that the provisions in section 22 were not mandatory, unless the President finds the facts as reported to him by the Tariff Commission are true.

I ask unanimous consent that that particular statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. GEORGE. * * * With reference to section 22, I wish to make clear precisely what can and cannot be done under it in view of the amendment striking out subsection (f) of section 22.

If the fact of interference by imports with a program of price support is shown—in other words, it must first be shown—the President must act under section 22.

Under section 22, this is the present requirement—

"Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture has reason to believe that any article or articles are being or are practically certain to be imported into the United States under such conditions and in such quantities as to render or tend to render ineffective, or materially interfere with, any program or opera-

I have referred to the colloquy in the RECORD with reference to that point. I responded that if that was the only way it could be done, I would see to it that a proper bill was introduced.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Of course, the Senator from Washington has no copyright on any ideas in the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are all trying to accomplish the same objective. I merely wished to point out for the benefit of the Senate that the bill introduced by the Senator from Nebraska is similar to the bill which was introduced by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and myself. I believe the language is very clear.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe it is a little improvement over the other bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is couched in the same language we used. We thought it would be very effective. We are glad that the Senator from Nebraska is adopting it.

Mr. WHERRY. I voted for it in the first place.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. The Senator from Nebraska has said that the purpose has not been accomplished. Let me say that the Committee on Finance went a very long way with us on the amendment in order to clear up the difficulty. The purpose has been accomplished insofar as future trade agreements are concerned.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I disagree with the Senator. Is the Senator talking about the new subparagraph (f)?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. It provides that an international agreement cannot be entered into which would override section 22.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Which would be inconsistent with section 22.

Mr. WHERRY. It is an excellent provision, but it still would not prevent—

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Nebraska would like to go further and do what the Senator from Oregon and I would have liked to do, namely, do away with the cumbersome procedure by which the President finally may act under the 50-percent leeway.

I am sure the Senator from Oregon and I would be glad to join the Senator from Nebraska in accomplishing that, or we shall be glad to have him join with us. I do not know which is preferable, but in any event we shall be glad to have that result achieved.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, first I should like to say that I shall be glad to have the Senator join with me; or if there is any element of pride of authorship in this case, I shall be glad to join with him. Certainly we wish to obtain this result.

It was not my purpose to adopt any particular language as my own, for in the course of my remarks I cited what was done in the past in regard to this matter.

There is a difference between the conclusion I reach and that reached by the Senator from Washington, for I think it is not sufficient to have a permissive

provision. When the Secretary certifies that these surpluses exist. I think it should be mandatory upon the President to rectify that situation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is what we think, too.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I hope the minority leader will not object to my standing on this side of the aisle when I discuss this matter at this time. It merely happens that I came to this side of the aisle to discuss with other Senators certain phases of this matter.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this is a bipartisan piece of proposed legislation, and it does not matter which side of the aisle the Senator stands on.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to thank the Senator from Nebraska for the support he has given in the past to the Magnuson-Morse amendment. As he has said, he has supported it. I compliment him for following the course of action he has followed today in including in his amendment what I consider to be at least the controlling principle of the Magnuson-Morse amendment. I assure the Senator that when we reach the floor fight on this issue, I shall give him the same support he has given in the past to the Magnuson-Morse amendment.

I also thank him for the record he made in regard to the history of this provision, both as it came from the House side and as it was enacted in the Magnuson-Morse amendment during the past several years on the floor of Senate. I quite agree with the Senator from Nebraska, as does my friend the Senator from Washington, that in connection with these proposals, there should be no pride of authorship or no pride as to origin.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. What we seek is the result. I have always hoped that we might have a mandatory provision. I still have a serious reservation of doubt as to whether we shall be able to go that far; but let us at least try to see how far we can go in that direction and at least get something of the sort on the statute books.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his observation, and I also thank the Senator from Washington.

I should like to say that the inspiration for this proposed legislation actually came from the colloquy I had with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. If Senators will read those observations, they will find why it is very necessary to amend section 22.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to say that the Finance Committee gave great consideration to the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I believe there were two or more of the amendments, and we were in very great sympathy with them.

However, we felt, as I stated on the floor to the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, that our primary responsibility and jurisdiction were over the trade-agreements matter; and that being so, I felt free to suggest that if the amendment which we had inserted was not entirely effective as it was inserted in the bill, section 22 might well be strengthened, the jurisdiction of section 22, of course, being properly in another Senate committee.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. I am very glad the Senator has offered the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much. That was the spirit in which the amendment was submitted.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to support very strongly the amendment submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. The amendment offered by the Senator from New York would exempt from the amendment of the Senator from Michigan the Public Health Service hospitals, the National Institutes of Health, the National Heart Institute, the National Cancer Institute, the National Mental Hygiene Institute, and the other institutes and services now being carried on by the Public Health Service.

The Senate committee has already cut by 5 percent the funds for personal services in these institutes. As we know, the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, if adopted, would cut by an additional 5 percent the funds for personal services in these institutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with me that, in view of the grave threat which hangs over our country and, for that matter, over civilization itself in these dark days of crisis, we had better proceed at an even more rapid rate, rather than at a slower rate, in building up the medical and health programs, so that from the standpoint of defense alone we shall be in the strongest possible position to take care of the tens of thousands of wounded persons whom it will be our burden to bear if an all-out war should occur in the immediate future?

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Oregon for the very wise and timely observation he has just made. He is eminently correct.

Mr. President, in this country we have always felt that we had unlimited manpower. The truth is, however, that the facts submitted to the Appropriations Committee show that today employment in the United States is higher than it was at its peak during World War II.

The distinguished Senator from Oregon is one of the ablest and most distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee. As he well knows, we have not yet filled the quota for our Armed Forces. We have not yet put our many plants and industries into full production. In fact, for the next months we are going to be busy in trying to find the necessary personnel to put into our plants and industries in order that we may carry forward our great defense program of production.

We could not be more negligent or more wasteful than we would be at this time if we were to disregard the compelling need for doing all we can to conserve our manpower and, through medical research and medical care, rebuild and bring into useful service and useful occupations all possible segments of our manpower.

Mr. President, as I have said, the amendment adopted by the Appropriations Committee would result in cutting by 5 percent the funds for these personal services. I think it would be a serious thing now to bring about an additional cut of approximately 5 percent, as proposed by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

The idea seems to prevail in some quarters that these personal services are being rendered primarily or usually in administrative work or in what might be called work simply to check on what is being done by means of Federal Government grants to hospitals and health institutions throughout the country for research programs. However, that idea is entirely erroneous.

The National Cancer Institute was mentioned earlier in the debate. When we consider that Institute, which was created by Congress as an agency of the Federal Government, we find that it has been established at Bethesda, Md. We find that today that Institute has a personnel of 678; and of that number, 545 are engaged in research work. Those 545 are scientists, doctors, or technicians. All of them are engaged in research work, in attempting to find the cause of cancer, in attempting in some way to prevent cancer, or to find a cure for cancer. Five hundred and forty-five of the six hundred and seventy-eight are engaged in actual research work. One hundred persons employed in the Institute are engaged in technical assistance to the States. This technical assistance to the States provides consultative services in the organization and operation of State-wide cancer-control programs, including the development and demonstration of improved methods for the early diagnosis of cancer and the investigation of occupational conditions which may cause cancer. As we know, in most instances, if cancer can be discovered in its early stages, it can either be removed by the surgeon's knife or burned out through the use of the X-ray or of radium, and the patient can be cured. The insidious thing about cancer is that it causes no pain to the sufferer until the disease has reached its later stages, when it is only too often impossible to remove the cancerous tissue or to effect a cure.

The program of technical assistance provides a total of 100 workers in the 48 States. If we add to the 48 States the District of Columbia and the Territories of Alaska, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii, we discover that we really have less than 2 persons for each of the 48 States of the Union who are to assist in giving technical assistance in this vitally important matter of cancer research, prevention, and cure.

Of the 678 persons employed in the Cancer Institute, we find that 11 are engaged in reviewing personally the research and training grants. Those 11 persons keep in touch with institutions which are to receive Federal grants, particularly hospitals and research institutions throughout the country, and constantly review this work to make sure that the research is going forward according to the intent and purpose in making the grants, and also to correlate and integrate the work which is being done throughout the country in the many different research hospitals and institutions. Of the 678 persons employed in the National Cancer Institute, but 22 are engaged in administrative work. This means that 656 of the 678 are entirely dissociated from administrative work, in connection with this important field of research.

Mr. President, cancer is now the No. 2 killer of our people. Only cardiac, vascular, and renal diseases cause a greater number of deaths than cancer. In 1949, one in every 47 people, who died in the United States, died of cancer. Twenty-two million of the people now living in the United States will die of cancer, unless new treatments, cures, or preventive measures are found. Almost 2½ times as many people in the United States died of cancer during World War II as were killed in action in the Armed Forces. In a recent Nation-wide poll, it was found that 82 percent of the people who were questioned said they believed that \$200,000,000 should be spent by the Government for cancer research. In this bill, we are providing something less than \$19,000,000.

It has been a long time since I have heard any testimony more encouraging than that given before the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the subject of research work, and the results which are coming from it. Dr. Rhoads, head of the great Memorial Cancer Center, in New York City, told us a most interesting and fascinating story of a machine which had been developed in the immediate past, and which takes a photograph showing cancerous cells in contradistinction to normal cells. As he said, if all the women who pass through the Grand Central Station in New York in 1 day were examined, it would be discovered that 1 out of every 320 was suffering from some form of cancer of the womb. If those women were examined according to the only methods available prior to the invention of this machine, each of them would be required to go to a hospital, to be anesthetized and to have a minor surgical operation, after which the slides containing the tissue removed in the course of the operation would have to be examined by a pathol-

ogist. It would require one pathologist to work more than 1 month in order to examine the slides of women suffering from cancer, who in 1 day's time passed through the Grand Central Station. As Dr. Rhoads said, even if all the women were willing to go to a hospital and undergo the operation and subject themselves to the examination, there would not be a sufficient number of pathologists available in the country to make the examinations. It is impossible to make these examinations today, for no other reason than the sore lack of pathologists.

Mr. President, the new cancer-detecting machine which has resulted from the research for which we are pleading this afternoon makes it possible for all those examinations to be made in 1 day. It requires no hospitalization of the women, no anaesthesia, no surgical operation, no huge expense. The machine takes the picture, and, if cancerous tissues are present, they show up in the picture.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am sure the Senator will find that the development of that one machine, constituting a great advance in the detection of cancer, and which is the real answer until we find an absolute cure for cancer, came as the result of the appropriation of funds which the Congress has appropriated, niggardly though they may be, to institutions for the purpose of protecting and improving the health of the people.

Mr. HILL. I am sure that, without the funds, the encouragement, and the inspiration which the Government has given in the matter of cancer research, we would not have this machine today. Forty years ago the No. 1 killer in the United States was tuberculosis; more people died from tuberculosis in this country than from any other cause. Today that is not true. Tuberculosis, as a killer, has now fallen into about ninth place. Why? Because of the X-ray machine; because pictures are made in the incipient stages of the disease, making it possible through prompt treatment to effect a cure. What the X-ray machine has done in connection with the treatment of tuberculosis, the new machine which I have described promises to do in the field of cancer.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Alabama knows that at the fourth assembly of the World Health Conference, which I attended recently as a delegate, Surgeon General Scheele was compelled by unanimous vote to assume the presidency of that organization and to take leadership in the world in connection with these matters.

Mr. HILL. That is correct and I thank the Senator from New York for bringing it to the attention of the Senate. I doubt if anywhere in the world we can find men who are more devoted or who are making a greater contribution to the welfare of mankind than are those in the

United States Public Health Service. The Senator from New York has recently returned from the great World Health Conference, and he comes to us today bearing testimony of the esteem and the appreciation in which the United States Public Health Service is held around the world.

Mr. President, the hour is late—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the Senator from Alabama knows, I have been active in this matter for a long time. I was one of the sponsors of the bill to establish the Institute. Cancer is a disease which has killed more persons than have all the wars combined. Each year we have spent less money on the cure of that disease than the cost of building one heavy cruiser.

Mr. HILL. Let me say to my friend that we got the atomic bomb because we were willing to spend some \$2,000,000,000 in order to get it. It was not a question whether we could afford to spend the money for the bomb. The proposition was that we could not afford not to have it. Where would we be today if we did not have that bomb? It is not a question of spending these relatively paltry sums of money for health services; it is a question of not being able to afford not to spend them. We must go forward with the research into the causes and treatment of diseases.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The irony of the matter is that, in spite of the small amount we appropriate because of the economic circumstances of the moment, the researchers do so well. The chairman of the subcommittee, as the Senator from Alabama knows, would have been willing to give them more money, but neither the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from New Mexico, nor the other members of the committee felt that under the circumstances we should do so. That is one of the reasons why I object strenuously to a cut of 10 percent on personnel for this noble and laudable work for humanity. It is not for destruction; it is not to kill people; it is not to wound people; it is to help them. It is for the common weal.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from New Mexico is absolutely right about that. He is chairman of the subcommittee that handles the bills which carry these funds, and he has spent many a long hour, many a long day, and many a long week listening to testimony and endeavoring to get the facts, giving his devoted interest to the subject, so that he might come to the floor prepared to let the Senate know how necessary and important it is to provide these funds. I pay my tribute to the Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the subcommittee, for his untiring work, for his great devotion, and for all his efforts in behalf of obtaining funds for this great research work in connection with the prevention and cure of diseases. Again and again he has demonstrated the humanitarian motives which actuate him.

Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate longer at this time. It is evident that at this late hour there will not be a vote, but I did not want the session to come to a close without placing in the RECORD these facts, and emphasizing that of the 678 persons employed in the National Institute of Health only 22 are engaged in administrative work, while 656 of them are engaged in the most vital and important work of research.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. Has the Senator had an opportunity to read the editorial in the New York Herald Tribune of today, entitled "Mr. Acheson's Defense," which I understand the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] put into the RECORD? If he has not done so, I suggest that he be sure to read it. I would commend it to the attention of every Senator, because it summarizes concisely the story of Mr. Acheson's testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee. I particularly commend it to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TART], who made a statement to the press today which, of course, is directly controverted by the editorial in the leading Republican newspaper of the United States.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield. The Senator from New York inserted the editorial in the RECORD earlier today, and I therefore yield to him at this time.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I was happy, indeed, to place the editorial in the RECORD this morning. I am grateful to the Senator from Connecticut for again bringing it to the attention of this body. I want to say, parenthetically, that not only was I glad and proud to place the editorial in the RECORD, but I am in full and complete agreement with the statements made in it. My agreement and my concurrence were due to the fact that I have followed the testimony at the meetings of the two committees sitting jointly, and in the press with great interest and with great industry, and I know that what the editorial says is correct and accurate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am extremely happy that the Senator from New York inserted that editorial in the RECORD. The only observation I would make is that, important as it is to protect the position of the Secretary of State, in my opinion cures for cancer, mental illness, and heart disease are just as important.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield, but first I may say there has been no Member of the Senate who has been more devoted and more tireless in his work and efforts in behalf of all our health institutes, and particularly as the author of the bill to establish a National Health Institute, than the Senator from Washington. He has always been on the battleline waging the fight for this great research work and for these institutes in an effort to defeat these dread diseases.

I now yield to my friend from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I appreciate what the Senator has said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can yield only for a question. Other Senators on the floor have been waiting an opportunity to be recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], who, I understand, desires the floor, will let us finish, I am sure he will be recognized.

Mr. MALONE. I am going to wait. The Senator need not worry about that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Alabama. I only hope all our efforts will not have been in vain.

Mr. President, I have to go to New York City to address a Maritime Day gathering on Monday, but hope to return in time to be present when the vote is had on the bill. I want the RECORD to show that I associate myself, of course, completely—leaving out the last remarks of the Senator from Alabama—with the objectives of the Lehman amendment and with what the Senator from Alabama has said. I appreciate his remarks very much.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at an earlier period this afternoon I had intended to offer en bloc a group of 12 amendments which would have had the effect of reducing appropriations by a total of about \$2,200,000. These amendments were part of a series of 21 that I had intended to submit. My amendment lettered B has already been accepted by the Senate and my amendment lettered A was replaced by the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] which the Senate has also accepted. It is my understanding that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], was willing to accept these amendments en bloc, but that upon objection by the Senator from Michigan this was not done.

The Senator from Michigan then obtained recognition for the submission of his amendment providing for a further 5 percent reduction in personal services, and that amendment, together with the Lehman amendment to his amendment, now constitute the question before the Senate.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to amendments lettered C, D, E, F, G, H, J, N, P, Q, R, and S. I ask that these amendments may be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 4, line 5, strike out "\$2,578,682" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,423,000."

On page 4, line 20, strike out "\$5,245,959" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,635,500."

On page 4, lines 20 and 21, strike out "\$1,513,765" and insert in lieu thereof "\$743,500."

On page 9, line 7, strike out "\$5,371,352" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,243,000."

On page 9, line 16, strike out "\$1,125,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000."

On page 10, line 11, strike out "\$8,365,304" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,000,000."

On page 12, line 7, strike out "\$5,172,975" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000,000."

On page 15, line 20, strike "\$3,397,706" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,253,000."

On page 23, line 19, strike out "\$1,166,465" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,100,000."

On page 33, line 15, strike out "\$2,150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,050,000."

On page 34, line 12, strike out "\$396,478" and insert in lieu thereof "\$372,000."

On page 31, line 5, strike out "\$1,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,463,400."

On page 31, line 13, strike out "\$1,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,450,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to point out that these proposals call for a reduction in appropriations of \$155,000 from the funds for salaries and expenses for the Bureau of Apprenticeship; \$610,000 from the appropriation for the employment work of the Bureau of Employment Security; \$128,000 from the funds for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Labor Statistics; \$125,000 from the appropriation for the Consumers' Price Index; \$365,000 from funds for salaries and expenses of the Wage and Hour Division; \$173,000 from the appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration; \$145,000 from funds for salaries and expenses in the Office of Education; \$66,000 from funds for salaries and expenses for hospital-construction services; \$100,000 from funds for salaries in the office of the Federal Security Administrator; \$24,000 from the appropriation for the office of the General Counsel of the Federal Security Administration; \$137,000 from the salaries and expenses of the Bureau of Public Assistance; and \$50,000 from salaries and expenses for the Children's Bureau.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee was willing at an earlier period in the afternoon to accept these amendments en bloc, in view of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Michigan has submitted an amendment, I hope the two Senators will be willing to incorporate these reductions in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan. They are not in contradiction or in opposition in any way to the reduction which the Senator from Michigan proposes. These reductions which I suggest are for total appropriations for specific items. The personnel reductions proposed by the Senator from Michigan can still take effect. So I hope very much that the Senator from Michigan will accept these amendments as a portion of his amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, at the time the Senator from New Mexico made the suggestion to the Senator Illinois that he was willing to accept his amendments en bloc, he was under the impression that both the economy-minded Senator from Illinois and the economy-minded Senator from Michigan were in accord. But inasmuch as the Senator from Michigan did not seem to be in accord with the Senator from Illinois and objected, I cannot at this particular time accept those amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator from Michigan, upon reflection, will now agree to this proposal.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan would like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Illinois, who has the floor, I believe.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. My question is whether the amounts represented by the Senator's amendments are not for personnel items?

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are not only for salaries but also for expenses. That is, they are the total salaries and expenses for the agencies involved, whereas the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is addressed purely to salaries. Mine is a proposal to reduce not only money for personnel, but also other expenditures such as transportation, printing, travel, and so on.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should be glad to look over the amendments and see whether they are in any way in conflict with my amendment. We discovered in connection with one item that an amendment would be in the third degree, and therefore would not lie.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. At this particular time I do not feel that I could allow these amendments to come in, since their adoption would possibly make of my amendment an amendment in the third degree and out of order, and would shut off this 10 percent cut in personnel.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan has been ruled to be an amendment in the first degree. The Lehman amendment has been ruled to be an amendment in the second degree, and therefore is appropriate. My amendments would also be amendments in the second degree. They are not in conflict with the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, but they impose cuts for both salaries and expenses of the bureaus, and not merely cuts in personal services.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I make a suggestion to the Senator from Illinois? Several Senators, some of whom are in accord with the proposals of the Senator from Illinois, and others who might be against them, would prefer that the Senator have the amendments printed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are all printed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So that they can have them before them and examine them then and consider them the next time the Senate meets.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They are all printed and are on the desks of all Senators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but it happens that the Senators are not here, and have gone away.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is no fault of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That, of course, is not the fault of the Senator from Illinois, but they were here probably some times when the Senator from Illinois was not. All I am asking is that we have an opportunity to examine the amendments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not asking for a vote on them today. I am merely asking the Senator from Michigan to accept these amendments as a portion of his amendment, so as to make a reduction not merely in salaries, as provided by the

Senator from Michigan, but in salaries plus expenses, and in some of these cases the cuts, even for personnel, would be more drastic.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I want a little time to look them over. I do not want to put myself in the position to kill the amendment providing for a 10-percent personal-services reduction. I may tell the Senator from Illinois that I share his views on this point of economy. It is my present intention to vote for his amendments. But I do not want to place them on the amendment the Senator from Michigan has put into the hopper, which is ready to be voted upon, and then to find that the amendments of the Senator from Illinois have in some way affected the philosophy of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to make an over-all cut of personnel.

As I understand, we are not going to vote this evening. The Senator has placed these amendments in the RECORD. Tomorrow I shall examine each one of them. I have in mind that I should like to accept them, but I do not want to do violence to the proposal for an over-all cut.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is very fine. The amendments will be in the RECORD, and I hope they can be accepted.

Mr. FERGUSON. I certainly will examine them, and see what I can do with them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we have reached a parliamentary low-pressure point, or a parliamentary vacuum. There seems to have been a general exodus from the Chamber after the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] was unable to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement. I hope very much that we will not postpone consideration of this measure until Monday.

AMENDMENT TO CUT NUMBER OF NEW AUTOMOBILES IN HALF

I have another amendment, with which I think nearly all Senators will agree, namely, a proposal to reduce the number of automobiles purchased by Government agencies. If Senators who are present will turn to my amendment lettered "T," as printed, they will see the proposal.

This is a proposal to cut in half the number of automobiles provided by the House for replacement purposes. It is a sort of Jensen amendment applied to automobiles.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me finish. It is a sort of Jensen amendment proposed for automobiles, namely, instead of replacing every worn-out automobile, to replace only half the automobiles worn out, and allow the number of automobiles to be diminished by a process of attrition, whereas the Jensen amendment is a proposal to allow the number of personnel to diminish by a process of attrition.

There as a further proposal, that no net additions to the automobile population shall be authorized. So these two

provisions, taken together, would reduce the total number of automobiles purchased by 79, and would effect economies, I think, totaling approximately \$100,000.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, without any commitment whatsoever on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee, I will say to the Senator from Illinois that the chairman of the subcommittee is inclined at least to be sympathetic toward the idea.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be fine if we could crystallize this apparent approval of the proposal into legislative sanction at this moment, so that instead of being paid with good will and generosity, to be cashed in at some future date, we could eliminate the 79 automobiles now? Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we suspend the present order of business and proceed to the consideration of my amendment lettered "T."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have a great deal of sympathy with the amendment to reduce the number of automobiles. The Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] have proposed that a certain number of chauffeurs be eliminated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is a proposal to reduce the number of automobiles.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is in line with the reduction in the number of chauffeurs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. This is Castor to the Senator's Pollux; Damon to his Pythias; Roland to his Oliver.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I cannot agree to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan at the moment, because I wish to see whether it would dispense with a number of passengers.

Mr. FERGUSON. First we want to reduce the number of prospective passengers by 10 percent. Then we get rid of the chauffeurs and the drivers of the cars, and finally we get rid of the cars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not all the cars. We would allow the total number of cars to diminish through failure to replace all those that are worn out. In other words, we go on the assumption that the avoirdupois of the transportation system of the Government is somewhat overdeveloped. A "fat boy's" diet would be extremely good to reduce the number of automobiles.

Will the Senator from New Mexico be kind enough to interpose no objection to this amendment, and accept it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. Between now and Monday I wish to study the question of passengers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New Mexico disappoints me. At first I thought he was going to accept the proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my amendment lettered "T"

printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 2, line 7, strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one."

On page 11, line 23, strike out "seven" and insert in lieu thereof "one."

On page 20, line 6, strike out "twenty" and insert in lieu thereof "seven."

On page 21, line 1, strike out "ten" and insert in lieu thereof "five."

On page 21, line 11, strike out "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof "ten."

On page 21, lines 23 and 24, and on page 22, in line 1, strike out "eleven passenger motor vehicles, of which nine shall be for replacement only" and insert in lieu thereof "four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only."

On page 23, line 18, strike out "three passenger motor vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof "one passenger motor vehicle."

On page 24, line 2, strike out "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "nine."

On page 24, lines 19 and 20, strike out "twelve passenger motor vehicles of which ten shall be for replacement only" and insert in lieu thereof "five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only."

On page 25, line 2, strike out "six" and insert in lieu thereof "three."

On page 25, line 18, strike out "six" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

On page 26, line 10, strike out "two passenger motor vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof "one passenger motor vehicle."

On page 29, lines 1 and 2, strike out "two passenger motor vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof "one passenger motor vehicle."

On page 29, line 8, strike out "three passenger motor vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof "one passenger motor vehicle."

On page 30, line 5, strike out "four" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, another amendment which I had intended to offer—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question with respect to the previous amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have many other amendments which I hope to offer, but because of the low-pressure situation in the Chamber, I have been unable to offer them.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WHERRY. I was about to ask if the amendment applied to automobiles in the military as well as automobiles in other Government agencies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. This amendment relates merely to the bill before us.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator from Illinois intend, if the amendment is adopted in connection with this bill, to continue the effort?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. This is a line of conduct which I have laid down for myself, and to which I hope to hew in the future.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator intend to offer the same amendment in connection with the military bills?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is a more difficult question. I intend to offer it at least in connection with the civil bills. I shall probably offer a similar amendment to the defense appropriation bill, although I have not studied the degree of the cut to propose.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator know how many automobiles the Government owns today?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have heard various estimates. I should be very glad to have the Senator from Nebraska state his idea and see whether his understanding agrees with mine.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not know what the Senator's understanding is, but I have been told that the Government has between 190,000 and 200,000 automobiles. However, that number includes the automobiles in the military.

I think the Senator's statement about cutting down the number of drivers and cars is fine; but what I should like to know is whether or not this amendment will be applicable only to the bill before us, or whether we are going straight down the line. I am not talking about the automobiles in Korea. I am talking about automobiles in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the intention of the Senator from Illinois to offer identical amendments to all the civil appropriation bills.

Mr. WHERRY. But not to the military bills?

Mr. DOUGLAS. When we come to the military bills, that question must be handled very carefully, because there is the problem of distinguishing between joy rides for the brass and efficiency for the combat forces. I think there are too many joy rides for the brass.

Mr. WHERRY. The ordinary soldier does not have an automobile. It is all brass, is it not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, there are jeeps.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not talking about jeeps. I am talking about passenger automobiles.

The reason I raise the question is this: We are talking about some of the small orders. Seventy-nine automobiles are peanuts as compared with 200,000 automobiles. I am in sympathy with the idea, but if we are to make a start, we should carry the program straight through.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say in reply to the query of the Senator from Nebraska that I intend to try to reduce the excessive use of automobiles in the military agencies as well as in the civilian agencies. If an amendment to accomplish that purpose can be properly drafted, I shall be very glad to support it.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator permit me—

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me finish.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Washington has been on his feet for some time. I should like to yield to him.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator permit me to answer the last observation, with respect to excessive use of automobiles?

Mr. DOUGLAS. For some time I have been denying my good friend from Washington the privilege of asking a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have a simple question to ask the Sena-

tor from Illinois. If he is going to start on a campaign to reduce the number of automobiles, I will say that so far as the military is concerned, there are no passenger automobiles in Korea. They are jeeps. I wonder if the Senator will apply the same formula to the reduction of automobiles, chauffeurs, and so forth, in connection with the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am perfectly ready to do so. I am perfectly ready to strike out appropriations for automobiles for the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Let me say that I am willing to vote to eliminate those automobiles. But I want the Senator to be consistent. I want him to make savings all along the line. I want him to come forward with an amendment reducing the number of automobiles in the Military Establishment. There is where the abuse lies, if there is any abuse in connection with the use of automobiles. Let us see what the Senator will do in connection with the ECA and other appropriations for which he has been voting 100 percent. Now he is talking about making little peanut cuts in some of the other appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not know why the Senator from Nebraska is becoming so exercised in this matter. I thought he was a zealous seeker after economy. I am making a similar effort.

Mr. WHERRY. I am. I am not a demagogue, either.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Illinois intend to apply his formula for the reduction of expenditures to our spending abroad?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I stated earlier in the afternoon in reply to a question from the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I believe, that I would not permit him to put me over a barrel on that subject, as has been the custom at certain times in the past. As to how much the reduction should be will have to be determined by existing conditions. I am seeking to be consistent. The Senator from Nebraska may doubt that that is a fact, but it is, nevertheless. In any event, I would suggest that he approve virtue wherever it manifests itself, even

though he may doubt how far that virtue
will go.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Illinois did not propose any cut in the ECA appropriation last year, did he?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. The Senate appropriations committee had already made a cut of approximately 10 percent in the ECA appropriation, and I supported that cut which I considered sufficient. Then I supported a further cut in funds for point 4. But right now we are considering the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill, and I think we should debate the issue presently before us.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, irrespective of what happened last year, I wish we could confine our discussion, if possible, to the pending bill. As I understand, no more than 79 automobiles could be cut by the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendment would not apply to the Navy, the Army, or Air Force?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That subject is not before us. I thought the Senator from Nebraska would speak to the issue, but apparently that is difficult.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The furthest the Senator from Illinois could go with his amendment would be that he would try to apply the same pattern to the other appropriation bills. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall try to be consistent. Am I to understand that the amendment has been accepted?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. The Senator from Illinois receives sympathy today. On Monday it may be accepted. It is not a promise, however.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have another amendment, on which I should like to make an adumbration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may have printed in the RECORD a chart which I know will be of interest to Senators in connection with the question of the automobiles which were under discussion? It relates to chauffeurs and drivers of passenger vehicles which were operated by the Federal Government as of July 1, 1950, at the beginning of the fiscal year 1951.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does it refer to the pending bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FERGUSON. It also refers to the Military Establishment in Washington.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is there a breakdown as between automobiles in the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency, on the one hand, and other departments?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I do not intend to object—may I ask the source of the chart?

Mr. FERGUSON. If I may make a statement, it would explain the chart.

Mr. HILL. The Senator has asked unanimous consent to insert the chart.

Mr. FERGUSON. The chart was prepared by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, and will be a part of its forthcoming report. I received the chart from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who was one of the sponsors of the 10 percent amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the chart and accompanying statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the chart and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

This table is based on data available as of July 1, 1950, the beginning of the current fiscal year. I notice some discrepancy between its totals and data prepared by the Bureau of the Budget and submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee by the General Services Administrator in hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill. I assume this discrepancy arises from some difference in base dates, since the Budget Bureau information was not dated.

Incidentally, I wish to note that the information for the Department of Defense includes both civilian and military personnel assigned as drivers. A breakdown between the two is available and may be illustrated by the fact that full-time chauffeurs employed by the Department of the Army in the Washington military district include 16 civilians and 199 military.

The amendment which I have offered is adapted to the present Labor-Federal Security bill. I wish to point out the figures for those agencies.

The Department of Labor has nine full-time chauffeurs, all of whom are in the District of Columbia, and one part-time chauffeur, also in the District.

The Federal Security Agency has 44 full-time chauffeurs, 37 of whom are in Washington and 7 in the field. It has 100 part-time chauffeurs, 13 of them in the District of Columbia and 87 in the field.

The agency also has 1,082 vehicles operated by persons not employed as chauffeurs and whose duties do not include those of motor-vehicle drivers, 76 of them in Washington, and 1,006 in the field.

Chauffeurs and drivers for passenger motor vehicles owned and operated by the Federal Government

[Data as of July 1, 1950 (beginning of fiscal year 1951)]

Agency	Number full-time chauffeurs and other employees employed as full-time drivers			Number part-time chauffeurs and other employees who serve as part-time drivers			Number vehicles operated by persons not employed as chauffeurs and whose duties do not include those of motor vehicle drivers		
	In District of Columbia area	In field	Total	In District of Columbia area	In field	Total	In District of Columbia area	In field	Total
Executive departments (except National Military Establishments):									
Agriculture.....	7		7	12		12	7	4,189	4,196
Commerce.....	21	4	25	7	16	23	80	1,292	1,372
Interior.....	9	4	13	5	273	278	71	6,204	6,275
Justice.....	14		14	6		6	8	3,005	3,013
Labor.....	9		9	1		1			
Post Office.....	2		2						
State.....	17	13	30		3	4	4	41	45
Treasury.....	9	80	89	1				60	60
				7	272	279	38	2,164	2,202

Chauffeurs and drivers for passenger motor vehicles owned and operated by the Federal Government—Continued

[Data as of July 1, 1950 (beginning of fiscal year 1951)]

Agency	Number full-time chauffeurs and other employees employed as full-time drivers			Number part-time chauffeurs and other employees who serve as part-time drivers			Number vehicles operated by persons not employed as chauffeurs and whose duties do not include those of motor vehicle drivers		
	In District of Columbia area	In field	Total	In District of Columbia area	In field	Total	In District of Columbia area	In field	Total
Executive Office of the President:									
Bureau of the Budget	3		3	2		2			
National Security Council	1		1						
National Security Resources Board	6		6						
Council of Economic Advisers				2		2			
Independent agencies:									
Atomic Energy Commission	8	191	199	23	4,755	4,778	2	1,505	1,507
Civil Aeronautics Board	2		2					23	23
Civil Service Commission	3		3	1		1			
Displaced Persons Commission				3		3			
Economic Cooperation Administration	12		12						
Export-Import Bank of Washington	1		1						
Federal Communications Commission							1		1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service				2		2			
Federal Power Commission	1		1						
Federal Reserve System	5		5	3		3		16	16
Federal Security Agency	37	7	44	13	87	100	76	1,006	1,082
Federal Trade Commission	1		1	1		1			
General Accounting Office	2		2	1		1	1		1
General Services Administration	20	1	21	3	5	8	6	50	56
Government Printing Office	2		2	2		2	2		2
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13		13	4		4	6	400	406
Interstate Commerce Commission								132	132
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	1		1	2	5	7	4	47	51
National Capital Housing Authority							2		2
National Capital Park and Planning Commission				1		1			
National Gallery of Art				3		3			
National Labor Relations Board	2		2	1		1			
Office of the Housing Expediter	3		3	3		3			
Panama Canal				2		2			
Railroad Retirement Board		2	2						
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	4		4	4		4	1	90	91
Securities and Exchange Commission	1		1	2		2			
Selective Service System	4		4	1		1		90	90
Smithsonian Institution	1		1				1		1
Tennessee Valley Authority								589	589
Veterans' Administration	18	928	946	22	395	417	15	1,131	1,146
Total, excluding National Military Establishment	239	1,180	1,419	140	5,811	5,951	325	22,034	22,359
National Military Establishment:									
Office of the Secretary of Defense	9		9	1		1			
Department of the Army	215	2,977	3,192		4,195	4,195	47	9,705	9,752
Department of the Air Force	167	2,571	2,738	50	3,374	3,424	24	1,742	1,766
Department of the Navy	174	1,242	1,416	126	3,209	3,335	111	3,401	3,512
Total, National Military Establishment	566	6,790	7,356	177	10,778	10,955	182	14,848	15,030
Grand total, including National Military Establishment	805	7,970	8,775	317	16,589	16,906	507	36,882	37,389

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in my remarks, a letter to me from Mr. Jess Larson, General Services Administrator, in response to an inquiry of mine relating to numbers, costs, and types of automobiles purchased for civilian agencies during fiscal year 1950 and fiscal year 1951 through February 20, 1951. The accompanying table shows that over one-fourth of these automobiles purchased are of the medium- and heavy-weight class. I should also like to insert letters and a similar table with respect to automobiles purchased by the military agencies, and an article appearing in the Chicago Daily News of April 9, 1951, by Edwin A. Lahey, on the extensive use of automobiles by the Federal Government.

There being no objection, the material referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 13, 1951.
Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Reference is made to your letter dated February 13, 1951, in which you requested the General Services Administration to furnish you with information relative to the number and cost of new passenger automobiles purchased by the Federal Government.

The attached tabulation has been prepared covering fiscal years 1950 and 1951 (through February 20, 1951), to show (1) the total number and cost of passenger automobiles purchased by the General Services Administration, (2) the average cost per vehicle, and (3) the number of vehicles purchased and the average cost per vehicle by

make, body style, and body type. The average unit costs shown in the tabulation are based on average f. o. b. factory prices which are exclusive of all accessories and transportation charges. Federal excise taxes are included. This base figure was used since it offers a true comparison of the price differential between makes body styles, and body types.

These purchases represents the requirements of all civilian executive agencies of the Government, together with some incidental purchases made for the legislative and judicial branches which were handled upon request. Pursuant to telephone conversation with Mr. Wallace of your office, arrangements are being made to secure and forward similar data with respect to purchases made by the military agencies as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

JESS LARSON,
Administrator.

Tabulation showing number and cost of passenger automobiles purchased by the General Services Administration during fiscal years 1950 and 1951 (through Feb. 20, 1951)

[NOTE.—Prices shown are f. o. b. factory and are exclusive of all accessories and transportation charges. Prices include Federal excise tax]

Make	Body style	Body type	Fiscal year 1950		Fiscal year 1951 (through Feb. 20, 1951)	
			Number of vehicles	Average unit cost	Number of vehicles	Average unit cost
Type I (lightweight):¹						
Chevrolet.....	Styleline.....	2-door sedan.....	112	\$1,073.60	119	\$1,073.60
Do.....	do.....	4-door sedan.....	510	1,109.80	330	1,109.80
Do.....	do.....	Coupe.....	21	1,016.40	27	1,016.40
Do.....	Standard.....	Station wagon.....	73	1,530.20	31	1,530.20
Ford.....	Deluxe.....	2-door sedan.....	329	1,090.00	81	1,075.00
Do.....	do.....	4-door sedan.....	937	1,125.00	493	1,110.00
Do.....	do.....	Coupe.....	31	1,020.00	19	1,000.00
Do.....	Custom.....	Station wagon.....	52	1,775.00	18	1,550.00
Plymouth.....	Special deluxe.....	4-door sedan.....	16	1,245.00		
Do.....	Deluxe.....	Station wagon.....			15	1,472.00
Willys-Overland.....		do.....			54	1,323.68
Type II (medium weight):¹						
Buick.....	Special.....	2-door sedan.....	1	1,399.95	1	1,399.95
Do.....	do.....	4-door sedan.....	6	1,399.95	48	1,399.95
Pontiac.....	Streamliner.....	2-door sedan.....	32	1,276.84	19	1,276.84
Do.....	Chieftain.....	4-door sedan.....	620	1,332.52	257	1,332.52
Do.....	do.....	Coupe.....	116	1,198.12	33	1,198.12
Do.....	Deluxe.....	Station wagon.....	34	1,733.20	27	1,733.20
Type III (heavy weight):¹						
Buick.....	Roadmaster.....	4-door sedan.....	1	1,627.64		
Cadillac.....	Model 6219.....	do.....			1	2,470.40
Do.....	Model 60-Special.....	do.....			1	2,897.40
Do.....	Model 75.....	Limousine.....			1	3,503.00
Chrysler.....	Crown Imperial.....	do.....			1	4,038.75

¹ Federal specification classifications:

	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1951 (through Feb. 20, 1951)
Total number of passenger automobiles purchased	2,891	1,576
Total cost of passenger automobiles purchased	\$3,452,224.49	\$1,878,194.18
Average cost per vehicle	\$1,194.13	\$1,191.75

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 30, 1951.
Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: Reference is made to your letter dated February 13, 1951, in which you requested information relative to the number and cost of new passenger automobiles purchased by the Federal Government and my reply dated March 13, 1951, transmitting a tabulation showing purchases made by the General Services Administration.

There is transmitted herewith the letter received from the Honorable J. D. Small, Chairman, Munitions Board, together with a tabulation showing similar information with respect to purchases made by the military agencies.

Sincerely yours,
JESS LARSON, Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE,
MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., April 10, 1951.
Hon. JESS LARSON,
Administrator,
General Service Administration.

DEAR MR. LARSON: In reply to your letter of March 22, 1951, we are transmitting herewith tabulations covering fiscal years 1950 and 1951 showing the total number and cost of passenger automobiles purchased by the Department of Defense during 1950 and those to be purchased or in the process of procurement as of March 13, 1951. These tabulations also show the average cost per vehicle, the number of vehicles purchased, and the average cost per vehicle, by make, body style, and body type.

As indicated through informal conversation with Mr. J. B. Hansen of your office, cer-

tain of the information presented in the attached tabulations of civilian type vehicles will vary slightly in certain cases owing to differences in record-keeping procedures between the civilian and military departments.

In transmitting this information, it should be noted that unit costs of vehicles purchased by the military departments vary, depending on amount of equipment included, such as heaters, defrosters, right hand drive, color, directional signals, etc.; while unit costs of vehicles purchased by the civilian agencies are exclusive of all accessories. Other price variations in the case of military vehicles are due to f. o. b. points, such as base plants, assembly plants or various destinations.

Sincerely yours,

J. D. SMALL,
Chairman.

Tabulation showing number and cost of passenger automobiles purchased by the Department of Defense during fiscal years 1950 and 1951 (through Mar. 13, 1951)

Make	Body style	Body type	Fiscal year 1950		Fiscal year 1951 (through Mar. 13, 1951)	
			Number of vehicles	Average unit cost	Number of vehicles	Average unit cost
Chevrolet	Styleline	4-door sedan	1,000	\$1,156	1,000	\$1,316
Do	do	do	177	1,205	13,079	1,193
Do	do	do			30	1,175
Ford	Deluxe	do			964	1,363
Chevrolet	Styleline	do	51	1,087		
Do	do	do	10	1,200		
Plymouth	Standard	do			850	1,284
Do	do	do			75	1,284
Do	do	do			79	1,284
Do	Not contracted	do			666	
Do	do	do			53	
Ford	Deluxe	do			19	1,295
Chevrolet	Styleline	do	914	1,283	189	1,330
Do	do	do	30	1,171		
Do	do	do	200	1,162		
Do	do	do	100	1,158		
Ford	Deluxe	do			73	1,275
Buick	Special	do			1	1,399
Do	do	do			113	1,399

Footnotes at end of table.

Tabulation showing number and cost of passenger automobiles purchased by the Department of Defense during fiscal years 1950 and 1951 (through Mar. 13, 1951)—Continued

Make	Body style	Body type	Fiscal year 1950		Fiscal year 1951 (through Mar. 13, 1951)	
			Number of vehicles	Average unit cost	Number of vehicles	Average unit cost
Pontiac	Standard	4-door sedan	29	\$ 1,382		
Buick	Special	do	3	1,399		
Do	do	do	250	1,399	28	\$ 1,399
Do	do	do	4	1,399	3	1,399
Do	do	do			27	1,399
Lincoln	Deluxe	do			1	1,392
Packard	7-passenger limousine	do			1	1,400
Chrysler	do	do			2	1,399
Do	do	do			1	1,399
Cadillac	do	do	1	2,590		
Chrysler	do	do			1	2,999
Packard	do	do	1	2,520		
Chrysler	do	do				2,999
Willys	7-passenger	Station wagon	14	1,882	10	1,628
Do	do	do	4	1,501		
Chevrolet	8-passenger	do	4	1,608	500	1,691
Do	do	do	15	1,590	5	1,632
Do	do	do	15	1,775	15	1,722
Do	do	do			15	1,905
	Not contracted				24	
	do				327	
	do				1,626	

¹ F. o. b. factory.
² F. o. b. destination.

NOTES

	Fiscal year 1950	Fiscal year 1951 (through Mar. 13, 1951)
Total number of passenger automobiles purchased	2,822	17,082
Total cost of passenger automobiles purchased	\$3,486,704	\$21,104,575
Average cost per vehicle	\$1,235.54	\$1,235.49

1. All automobiles, light, medium, heavy, are of the 4-door type. Station wagons, 7-passenger, are 2 door, and station wagons, 8-passenger, are 4-door.
2. All unit costs shown are weighted average prices. These prices vary depending on amount of equipment included, such as heaters, defrosters, right-hand drive, color, directional signals, etc. Other price variations are due to f. o. b. points, such as base plant, assembly plants, or various destinations.
Unit costs of vehicles purchased by the military departments vary, depending on amount of equipment included, such as heaters, defrosters, right-hand drive, color, directional signals, etc.; while unit costs of vehicles purchased by the civilian agencies are exclusive of all accessories. Other price variations in the case of military vehicles are due to f. o. b. points, such as base plants, assembly plants, or various destinations.

**"LIBERALLY" INTERPRETED—UNITED STATES
AIDES GET AROUND LAW CURBING CAR USE**
(By Edwin A. Lahey)

WASHINGTON.—Senator FULBRIGHT of Arkansas spoke feelingly the other day about the dull moral sensibilities of men in public life.

He particularly lamented the number of Government fat cats who are driven to and from the office, and on their social rounds, at the expense of the taxpayers, in official limousines with liveried chauffeurs.

The visitor in Washington who gets a glimpse of the lordly Federal payroller riding alone in one of those big black jobs designed for six pallbearers might be inclined to agree with Senator FULBRIGHT that most of these "stiffs" ought to use the bus or take a cab to go to work or to a cocktail party.

There is a law designed to limit the number of officials who have a limousine and chauffeur at their command for personal business, but it is the most liberally interpreted statute since the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850.

Public Law 600, passed in 1946, prohibits the use of Government automobiles for any-

thing but official business, with a few specified exceptions.

The President, the heads of the executive departments, Cabinet officers, and high officials in the diplomatic service are exempt from this law.

But these exemptions have been broadened to include underlings of the President and the Cabinet officers.

At least six members of the White House staff have chauffeured limousines at their disposal, according to one estimate by a White House official.

These are the three Presidential secretaries, William Hasset, Matt Connelly, and Joe Short; the two assistants to the President, John R. Steelman and Averill Harriman, and the President's counsel, Charles Murphy.

The Pentagon makes the White House look frugal in its assignment of private limousines.

About 25 officials of the Department of Defense have chauffeured limousines at their disposal, according to John G. Adams, chief counsel at the Pentagon.

These include the Secretary, the Deputy Secretary, the three Secretaries of the armed services, three Under Secretaries, six Assist-

ant Secretaries, three Chiefs of Staff, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Federal Government owns 558 passenger automobiles in the District of Columbia. They are under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, which buys them for all the agencies except the White House, the Department of Defense, and Congress.

The General Services Administration reports that of the 52 cars assigned to the Department of the Interior, 6 are allocated to the Secretary's office.

The Treasury has 48 cars in Washington, with 6 of them assigned to the administrative service, or brass.

Four of the Department of Agriculture's 15 automobiles are assigned to the Secretary's office. Six of the 54 cars in the Department of Commerce are assigned to the brass.

The Senate by statute provides four official automobiles. They are at the command of the Vice President, the President of the Senate pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders.

The House has only one official limousine, the hack provided for the Speaker.

PROPOSED CUT OF \$9,000,000 IN FUNDS FOR
MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF CERTAIN
SCHOOLS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, another amendment which I intend to introduce is an amendment on page 16, line 9, to reduce the figure from \$40,000,000 to \$31,000,000. I now send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be ordered to lie on the table and to be printed. I also ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to be permitted to finish the discussion.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. I did not hear the Senator's request. Is he asking that the amendment be printed and lie on the table?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is double request. I submitted the amendment and asked that it lie on the table and be printed. I also asked that the text of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendment submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS was received, ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 16, line 9, strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$31,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the facts about the maintenance and operation costs of schools in federally affected areas, as I understand them, are as follows: Forty-one and a half million dollars would pay 100 percent of all the additional costs of maintenance and operation of schools in federally affected areas. The appropriation proposed by the Senate committee, of \$40,000,000, would provide 97 percent of the added expense. The \$28,000,000 as proposed by the House would provide approximately 68 percent. The amendment which I am offering, for \$31,000,000, would provide 75 percent. It is \$3,000,000 higher than the House figure, but \$9,000,000 below the Senate committee figure.

In view of the fact that it is difficult to compute what the added cost of operating schools in the federally affected areas would be, because there is a natural tendency to overestimate the costs; it does not seem to me to be wise for the Federal Government to meet the entire added cost, as computed. Part of the added cost could well be met by the localities through ultimate greater tax revenue, part of which is not an additional cost at all, but only a paper cost. We could save \$9,000,000 by meeting 75 percent of the estimated cost, instead of 97 percent, as provided for in the committee's proposal. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state his request again?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that the reduction of \$9,000,000 be agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

PROPOSED CUT OF \$1,800,000 FROM FUNDS FOR
DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Another amendment which I propose to introduce deals with striking out approximately \$1,800,000 for so-called distributive education, which was eliminated by the House but restored by the Senate committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 14, line 20, strike out "\$20,017,760" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,223,261."

On page 14, line 23, strike out "\$19,847,760 for the current fiscal year" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,048,261 for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out, if I may, that distributive education is of somewhat dubious value, despite all the arguments that have been made in its behalf. Vocational education in agriculture, industrial arts, and home economics probably stands on rather firm ground. However, to teach a high-school student how to sell groceries or clothes would hardly seem to me to be a wise expenditure of Federal funds at the present time. We would spend \$1,800,000 of Federal funds, which, when added to State and local contributions, would make a total of \$3,600,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MONRONEY. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if he is aware of the fact that a vast amount of help is also received by adults under the program. It is not only a high-school program, although it does enable a great many high-school students to earn money with which to finish their high-school education, because they receive training in salesmanship. Furthermore, many men who had manual jobs have become salesmen in industry by means of this type of program, which is part and parcel of vocational distributive education.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to the Senator from Oklahoma that it is true that training for adults is given through the form of continuation classes, as well as training for high-school students; but a considerable portion of the funds are used for high-school students, and in their case it seems to me that it is much better for them to be given training in English composition, algebra, and so forth, rather than training in the art of selling—for instance, selling ribbons. It seems to me that a general high-school education will be much better for them to have in connection with salesmanship. I believe that training in the art of selling is an area in connection with the welfare state into which we should not go, right now, at least.

As a matter of fact, one weakness of our industrial life during the present period is a tendency to place too much

emphasis upon selling, rather than upon production.

Mr. MONRONEY. However, how much can we progress unless we develop the distributive trades? I think retailing is one of the important segments of our business life. Although general education is most necessary, of course, yet I believe that training in retailing, particularly to enable small business to compete with the chain stores, is most important.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course that point can be raised in an attempt to justify a retail-training program. However, I would say there is not much difficulty in finding markets right now. The latent desire of the American people to consume, their desire for a higher standard of living than the one they already possess, is far in excess of the present productive capacity of our industry. I think there is no need to stimulate the American people to greater wants. That is already being done by advertising and by other means.

Although, of course, I wish to exempt the Senator from Oklahoma from this statement, yet I believe that on the whole the great demand for this appropriation of \$1,800,000 comes from the teachers of retail services. They have organized a lobby in virtually every State, and have organized a letter-writing campaign and a telegram-sending campaign in regard to the need for distributive education, because their jobs are in danger. That is where the pressure comes from.

We find that we build up vested interests which in turn demand their maintenance and expansion.

I think these teachers can be restored to even more productive occupations. So I hope very much that the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Objection is heard.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Presiding Officer has a much more acute ear than I have, it seems, for I did not hear an objection made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair objects.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I beg pardon; I was not able to read the Chair's inner mind.
PROPOSED REDUCTION OF \$960,000 FROM GENERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES

Mr. President, another amendment which I intend to offer is on page 21, in line 2. By means of this amendment we shall reduce the amount proposed to be appropriated for technical assistance and the collection and compilation of mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics, from \$15,960,000 to \$15,000,000, or a saving of \$960,000.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment printed at this point in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 21, line 2, strike out "\$15,960,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment calls for a reduction in the amount proposed to be devoted for obtaining vital statistics and other matters. I certainly wish to pay tribute to the importance of vital statistics in the past, in making comparisons of death rates and sickness rates. However, like every other good thing, this can be carried too far during a period when we need retrenchment. A reduction of 6 percent in the amount provided for this purpose does not seem to me to be excessive.

I now ask unanimous consent that the amendment be approved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF \$20,000,000 FROM FUNDS FOR HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now come to something which will hurt me very much, namely, a proposal to reduce the amount to be appropriated for hospitals, from \$195,000,000 to \$175,000,000, or a saving of \$20,000,000.

No one likes hospital construction more than I. But as the level of defense spending rises we simply must cut back nondefense spending. Therefore, I am asking that we hold to the House figure of \$175,000,000, which is only \$10,000,000 below the total voted for the fiscal year 1950-51, but a saving of \$20,000,000 below the Senate committee figure.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the amendment submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 23, line 9, strike out "\$195,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$175,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be accepted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF \$3,000,000 FROM FUNDS FOR MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment on page 32, in line 6, namely, to reduce from \$33,000,000 to \$30,000,000 the appropriation for grants to States for maternal and child health services, services for crippled children, and child welfare services as authorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security Act, as amended. These funds are credits to the States for maternal and child health services. There is a \$3,000,000 carry-over. This amendment would reduce by the amount of that carry-over the amount to be appropriated, and therefore that agency would not suffer to the degree that it might at first appear.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be approved.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, inasmuch as we are very desirous of taking care of the children of the country, although the Senator from Illinois appears not to want to do that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

PROPOSED REDUCTION IN ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now offer another amendment, namely, on page 41, in line 24, to strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the payment of remuneration for annual or sick leave of classified or Wage Board employees in excess of 20 days of annual leave per year or 12 days of sick leave per year."

I should like to speak to that amendment for a moment, and then I shall ask unanimous consent that the amendment be approved.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from Illinois know that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and this is subject to a point of order? I have no objection to having the Senator from Illinois discuss the merits of the amendment, of course.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that the bill already contains certain provisions, which were included in the bill by the House of Representatives, which would seem to be legislation, and this amendment is merely offered to a legislative provision which already has been included in the bill by the House of Representatives. Furthermore, the amendment is a limitation on funds. Therefore, as such, I do not believe the amendment is subject to a point of order.

Mr. President, this amendment in regard to annual leave has solid merit behind it. I think all of us know the circumstances in regard to annual leave for Wage Board and classified employees, with the exception of employees in the postal service. They are entitled to 26 days of annual leave a year. On the surface that provision would seem to be all right. However, it has been interpreted to mean 26 working days; and inasmuch as Government employees are on a 5-day week, that amounts to 5½ weeks of annual leave a year.

Similarly, the 15 working days of sick leave amount to 3 weeks a year.

If we add to that the eight holidays—in other words, 26 working days, plus 15 working days, plus 8 holidays—and then add unstated holidays for ceremonial occasions, such as when a Brazilian President or a French President comes to Washington and the Government offices are let out in order to provide such celebrities with an audience. Then add the days in summer when the temperature rises to such an extent that the Government employees are let out from work, and if we add to all that the "coffee time," I think it can be seen that at the present time the employees of the Federal Government in Washington are not subjected to excessive labor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator will state the matter in the opposite way, namely, the number of days that Federal Government em-

ployees in Washington actually work. It might take less time if the Senator would state the matter in that way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would say that if, along with 26 days annual leave, 8 holidays, and other time off the 15 days of sick leave are taken into consideration—in my opinion the work actually done by Government employees will be found not to amount to more than from 207 to 209 working days—at least, in Washington. I do not wish to launch upon a demagogic attack on Government employees, but I believe in the amendment I have submitted.

Mr. President, this amendment is simply a proposal to make the annual leave of Government employees 20 working days, which would amount to 4 weeks, which with week ends would be 1 month; and to reduce sick leave from 15 working days, or 3 weeks, to 12 working days, or 2½ weeks. As a result, this amendment would probably save \$5,000,000 a year, ultimately, in connection with this bill. If all annual and sick leave were taken, the saving would be nearly five and a half million. If the amendment were applied to all governmental service, it would result in saving approximately \$150,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point, a table showing how the \$5,000,000 saving is computed. The table shows a saving of \$5,428,300, but undoubtedly all leave will not be taken so I will not claim a saving of more than \$5,000,000.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed as follows:

Department of Labor

Employees, March 1951.....	17,656
Salaries, March 1951.....	\$2,571,000
Average monthly salary.....	\$335.80
Average annual salary.....	\$4,030
Average daily salary (260 days).....	\$15.50
Saving by reducing annual leave 6 days (from 26 to 20) per employee.....	\$93.00
Saving, 7,656 employees.....	\$712,008
Saving by reducing sick leave 3 days (from 15 to 12) per employee.....	\$46.50
Saving, 7,656 employees.....	\$356,004
Total savings, annual and sick, 7,656 employees.....	\$1,068,012

¹ Byrd committee, RECORD, June 7, 1951, p. 6371.

Federal Security Agency

Employees, March 1951.....	35,107
Salaries, March 1951.....	\$10,582,000.00
Average monthly salary.....	\$301.50
Average annual salary.....	\$3,610.00
Average daily salary (260 days).....	\$13.80
Savings by reducing annual leave 6 days (26 to 20) per employee.....	\$82.80
Savings, 35,107 employees.....	\$2,906,859.60
Savings by reducing sick leave 3 days (15 to 12) per employee.....	\$41.40
Savings, 35,107 employees.....	\$1,453,429.80
Total savings, annual and sick, 35,107 employees.....	\$4,360,289.00
Plus Department of Labor.....	\$1,068,012.00

Total savings in H. R. 3709..... \$5,428,300.00

¹ Byrd committee report, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 7, 1951, p. 6371. Savings based on full use of annual and sick leave.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I intend to offer similar amendments to this on subsequent appropriations.

Mr. President, in view of the seriousness of the military situation, I do not believe that governmental employees should ask for 5½ weeks vacation. That would certainly seem to be one of the accessories, one of the surpluses, which we could eliminate in a period of emergency. I am in favor of the increase in pay to Government employees, now being drafted, I understand, by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of about 8 percent, which helps to meet the increase in the cost of living during the past year.

I am for justice in the pay scales, but the leave provision has grown up by accident. As I trace its history, it is approximately as follows: In 1898, at the time of the Spanish-American War, Congress passed a bill providing 30 days' leave. I think that what the Congress plainly intended was to obtain for civil employees the same leave which military personnel obtained, which was 30 days. I think Congress then thought they were providing 30 calendar days, but an executive interpretation of that law was made, so that it provided for 30 working days. The Government then being on a 6-day week, this provided 5 weeks' vacation. This continued until 1933, when the Economy Act of 1933 decreased leave to 15 days, which meant 2½ weeks. Then, in 1936, it was increased to 26 days.

The Government was still on a 6-day week. I think once again it was the intention of Congress in 1936, as it had been in 1898, to provide a month's vacation, but in 1945, after the termination of the war, the Government went on a 5-day week, so that the 26 days then became, by accident, not a month, but 5½ weeks.

I think we should eliminate this anomaly and save \$150,000,000, and my amendment is merely the kick-off for that event. When I proposed it last year, I received 1,000 letters from governmental employees in the State of Illinois—about 1,000 of the most bitter letters I have ever received in my life—reminding me that there were 81,000 governmental employees in the State, and that every one of them would be waiting for me with a club if and when I came up for reelection in 1954.

I think there is no doubt that this proposal will probably arouse tremendous opposition on the part of public employees; but public employees are patriotic, too. They should realize that we are facing a big governmental deficit, that they should make their contribution, and that, if we protect them on their basic pay and give them a degree of security which no other class in our society has—and I think we should properly give them security—they should not insist on this 5½ week's vacation.

Furthermore, every study that has ever been made, indicates that 20 working days vacation and 12 days sick leave is very liberal in comparison with that given employees in private industry. In private industry the prevailing rate is 10 days. A small percentage, give long service employees 15 days and the per-

centage granting 20 days is negligible. I want the Government to be a liberal employer. That is why I am willing to grant 20 days. But there is such a thing as carrying a good thing too far at the expense of the public.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely want to say to the Senator, in the form of a question, that I realize what he is proposing is subject to a point of order, which has been raised. The same issue is being raised in connection with the independent offices bill now before the Appropriations Committee, and the Senator from Michigan was attempting to get an amendment in that bill this morning which would provide that employees would get the 3 weeks' vacation, which would be 15 days. There is always a misunderstanding, as the Senator has pointed out, on the floor. When some persons talk about 26 days' leave, they seem to think that it is a month's leave.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is 36 and 37 days.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is five—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Five and one-fifth weeks.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is 5 workweeks plus 1 day. Therefore, I am hoping that the committee as a whole will, the next time the independent offices bill is taken up, adopt a rule whereby governmental employees will be able to get something like 15 days, which is really 3 workweeks, plus, as the Senator says, the week end of another week.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think 15 days may be a little too low. I should be willing to give them 20 days.

Mr. FERGUSON. They would get that as a matter of course. Then, as a matter of discretion, they could be given the extra time, and the Senator from Michigan would say that could be up to 5 days more, because, when we are at war, I

think there ought to be discretion in the administrator to have employees work longer and harder than in normal times.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad that the thoughts of the Senator from Michigan are moving in the same direction with mine, and I hope, therefore, that he will join me in my request for unanimous consent that this amendment be now adopted in the present measure.

Mr. FERGUSON. I join the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think, in view of our representations, we should be able to obtain it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan from this side of the aisle will join the Senator from Illinois in asking approval of the amendment, but he feels that there may be some who are in the Chamber who would object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not understand that objection had been raised to this unanimous-consent request. So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this provision be inserted in the bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, for the present, at least, I shall have to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Alabama dashes my hope. Mr. President, these all are the amendments which I intend to offer. I regret that they have not been adopted today by unanimous consent, but I hope that they will be adopted by a majority vote when they are passed upon by the Senate.

Many of the amounts involved probably seem small. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to insert, at this point in the RECORD a table showing the combined amounts of the cuts involved to show that, in total, they represent reduction of \$44,000,000 below the Senate committee recommendations and \$47,000,000 below the budget.

There being no objection, the table was ordered printed, as follows:

Item	Purpose	Douglas proposal	Senate committee	Amount of Douglas proposal below—	
				Senate committee	Budget request
Department of Labor:					
Office of Secretary of Labor ¹	Salaries and expenses.....	\$1,255,000	\$1,400,000	\$145,000	\$220,000
Office of Solicitor ²	do.....	1,575,000	1,669,445	94,445	175,000
Bureau of Apprenticeship.....	do.....	2,423,000	2,578,682	155,682	269,000
Bureau of Employment Security.....	do.....	4,635,500	5,245,959	610,459	839,500
Do.....	Veterans' Employment Service.....	743,500	1,513,765	770,265	839,500
Bureau of Labor Statistics.....	Salaries and expenses.....	5,243,000	5,371,352	128,352	692,000
Do.....	Revision, Consumers' Price Index.....	1,000,000	1,125,000	125,000	250,000
Wage and Hour Division.....	Salaries and expenses.....	8,000,000	8,365,304	365,304	740,000
Federal Security Agency:					
Food and Drug Administration.....	do.....	5,000,000	5,172,975	172,975	395,000
Office of Education.....	do.....	3,253,000	3,397,706	144,706	247,000
Do.....	Vocational education (distributive education).....	18,223,261	20,017,760	1,794,500	1,794,500
Do.....	Maintenance and operation of certain schools.....	31,000,000	40,000,000	9,000,000	9,000,000
Public Health Service.....	Assistance to State—General.....	15,000,000	15,960,000	960,000	1,084,000
Do.....	Hospital construction.....	175,000,000	195,000,000	20,000,000	20,000,000
Do.....	Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services.....	1,100,000	1,166,465	66,465	120,000
Bureau of Public Assistance.....	Salaries and expenses.....	1,463,400	1,600,000	137,000	235,000
Children's Bureau.....	do.....	1,450,000	1,500,000	50,000	100,000
Do.....	Grants to State—maternal and child welfare.....	30,000,000	33,000,000	3,000,000	3,000,000

¹ Supplanted by WILLIAMS' amendment accepted by Senate.

² Accepted by Senate.

Item	Purpose	Douglas proposal	Senate committee	Amount of Douglas proposal below—	
				Senate committee	Budget request
Office of the Administrator.....	Salaries and expenses.....	\$2,050,000	\$2,150,000	\$100,000	\$369,000
Do.....	Salaries and expenses, general counsel.	372,000	396,478	24,500	55,000
General amendment.....	Reduce automobiles.....			100,000	100,000
Do.....	Reduce annual sick leave.			5,000,000	5,000,000
Total savings (figures rounded).				44,000,000	47,000,000

CIVILIAN BUDGET CUT 20 PERCENT

REDUCED BY \$163,160,885

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the junior Senator from New Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], and myself, I submit the following amendment which I ask to have printed and to lie on the table.

At the proper place in the bill insert:

"SEC. . The appropriations contained in the various items of the bill and any amounts authorized to be expended, with the exception of the Railroad Retirement Board appropriations, and that part of the Federal Security appropriations relating to old-age pensions, are reduced respectively by the amount of 20 percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

VETERANS NOT IN THIS BILL

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should first like to clarify the RECORD somewhat because of the prolonged debate—the veterans, disabled or otherwise, are not included in this bill.

FEDERAL SECURITY

The Veterans' Administration and other provisions for disabled and other war veterans are included in the independent offices bill. This bill is for Federal Security, alone.

I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] be added to the names of the sponsors of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MALONE. I also ask that my remarks, now to be made, be included in the RECORD, following the offering of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the offices included in this bill always come in for a deficiency to make up for any Senate cut. It might be a good idea to prohibit such a procedure without the sanction of the Appropriations Committees of both Houses and approved by the President.

The amendment proposed by the junior Senator from Nevada provides for a 20-percent cut in a bill totaling \$2,528,338,831, with the exception of that part of the Federal Security appropriation which relates to old-age pensions, amounting to about \$1,150,000,000, and the Railroad Retirement Board pensions of \$562,534,409. That is a total of \$1,712,534,409 excluded from the proposed cut. Subtracted from the total amount of the bill as presented to the Senate there remains \$815,804,422; 20 percent of that amount would be \$163,160,885, the amount of the reduction which is requested.

TUBERCULOSIS AND CANCER

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nevada has listened very patiently all afternoon to a discussion of the items on tuberculosis and cancer. That they are very important I have realized for many years, and these items have my entire support. But there is so much emphasis placed upon them for the benefit of the public that the implication is that we cannot touch any of the bill because these two items are included.

I invite attention to the fact that the tuberculosis item is \$8,887,351, and the cancer item is \$19,805,171. Taken together, a 20-percent reduction would amount to less than \$5,000,000 out of a proposed reduction total of more than \$163,000,000.

WASHINGTON AUTOMOBILES

With reference to the item of automobiles, which consumed about an hour. I very seldom find myself in agreement with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], but this time I would go farther than he proposes. Any time between 5 and 8 o'clock, when we leave the Senate floor, it is impossible to park my automobile within four blocks of my hotel on account of the Cadillacs, Packards, and Lincolns parked in the middle of the street with uniformed chauffeurs guarding them.

I wear no badge, so am not identified; therefore there is nothing to do but park my car and walk back to the hotel. It would seem that there is a surplus of automobiles of the larger type in the city of Washington. Most of the time Senators ride in cabs or in the smaller type of automobiles if, in fact, we are able to afford one.

It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada that there is no reason for a Cabinet officer or any other officer who has his headquarters in Washington being furnished an automobile at all at public expense any more than such a car should be furnished to a Senator.

In asking for a 20-percent decrease in the civil appropriation bill to apply to the national defense, the junior Senator from Nevada is mindful that the national defense bill will necessarily be a large one.

BILLIONS FOR SOCIALIST NATIONS OF EUROPE

For 3½ years of the 4 years in which I have been a Member of the Senate, I have debated on the floor the advisability of furnishing billions of dollars to Socialist-minded governments of Europe to keep them in power. There has been a minimum of debate on the part of the majority against this type of abuse of the taxpayers of America. I understand that we shall receive a bill providing for between eight to eleven billion dollars for Europe again to make up deficiencies in connection with their purchases, to permit them to live on the scale that America lives. The 1934 Trade Agreements Act extended last week extends the power of the Secretary of State for an additional 2 years over the jobs and investments of the people of America. I hope he will be satisfied when he has leveled our standard of living with the sweatshop labor nations of the world, if he remains that long.

APPROPRIATION COMPARISONS, 1941-50

In order to understand the figures and the amounts of money asked for in connection with civilian purposes, I wish to address myself to several agencies of the Government in that connection.

Amounts of money mean little, whether they are thousands or millions or billions of dollars. The public is a little "punch drunk" with reference to the decimal points in appropriations.

Sometimes the junior Senator from Nevada thinks that the Senate is getting a little "punch drunk," also.

The Department of Labor is a fine Department. In 1941 it had an appropriation of approximately \$24,000,000. In 1950 the appropriation was \$58,404,231, indicating an increase of practically three times the amount appropriated in 1941.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a table, under the letterhead of the Department of Labor, showing the amounts appropriated for that Department from 1941 to 1950, inclusive.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND MANAGEMENT,

Washington, July 31, 1950.

Memorandum to: Mr. Everard H. Smith,
Clerk of the Senate Subcommittee on Labor-FSA Appropriations.

From: V. S. Hudson.

Pursuant to your request there is indicated below the amounts appropriated to

the Department of Labor for the past 10 years:

Year:	Amount
1941-----	\$23,401,780
1942-----	24,444,990
1943-----	26,111,780
1944-----	55,077,350
1945-----	71,588,813
1946-----	80,314,669
1947-----	140,481,443
1948-----	86,576,016
1949-----	15,351,800
1950-----	58,404,231

Mr. MALONE. The National Labor Relations Board, in 1942, exclusive of salaries and expenses, received an appropriation of \$3,395,710. In 1950, the appropriation was \$8,550,000. That amount is, roughly, two and one-half times the amount previously appropriated. That includes the entire National Labor Relations Board.

I ask unanimous consent to have a table relating to that Board inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National Labor Relations Board

CLERK'S NOTE.—The Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1948, consolidated under a single heading "Salaries and expenses" the several appropriations made for the Board's expenses for 1948. The 1949 regular bill continued this arrangement. Following is a table reflecting combined appropriations and estimates for prior years under the several headings. The amounts include supplementals and deficiencies and national-defense funds.

Appropriations:

1942-----	\$3,395,710
1943-----	3,641,270
1944-----	3,492,500
1945-----	3,634,373
1946-----	4,307,520
1947-----	4,453,500
1948-----	4,974,700
Supplemental-----	1,000,000
1949-----	9,400,000
1950 (third deficiency, 1949)-----	8,550,000

Estimates:

1942-----	3,523,770
1943-----	3,847,190
1944-----	4,211,055
1945-----	4,166,700
1946-----	5,514,314
1947-----	5,855,000
1948-----	7,804,000
Supplemental-----	1,025,300
1949-----	9,400,000
1950-----	9,000,000
1951-----	8,615,000

¹ Based on revised estimate of requirements under the new Labor-Management Relations Act.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, we now come to the National Mediation Board. It will be noted that I am taking these agencies in order as they appear in the report of the Senate committee accompanying the bill even though not included in the proposed 20-percent cut.

The National Mediation Board, for salaries and expenses in 1942, had an appropriation of \$172,158; in 1950, it was \$360,400.

The Arbitration and Emergency Board of the National Mediation Board had a total in 1946 of \$100,000, with a supplemental appropriation of \$23,000. In 1950 it had \$100,000 with a supplemental

appropriation of \$75,000. I suppose, Mr. President, that is the same as a deficiency appropriation.

The National Labor Adjustment Board, which is a part of the National Mediation Board, had in 1942 a total of \$224,530; in 1950, it had \$468,100, and a supplemental appropriation of \$207,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the tables relating to the National Mediation Board be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

National Mediation Board—Salaries and expenses

CLERK'S NOTE.—The items "Salaries and expenses" and "Printing and binding" were consolidated in 1950 into a single "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for the National Mediation Board. Following is a combined statement of appropriations and estimates for these items in prior years:

Appropriations:

1942-----	\$172,158
1943-----	173,355
1944-----	187,000
1945-----	202,500
Supp. (Public, 500)-----	14,400
1946-----	235,400
1947-----	319,000
1948-----	337,700
1949-----	339,600
Pay Act (Public, 119)-----	3,700
1950-----	360,400

Estimates:

1942-----	172,779
1943-----	177,355
1944-----	187,000
1945-----	214,000
Supplemental-----	14,400
1946-----	240,400
1947-----	351,200
1948-----	347,700
1949-----	339,600
Pay Act (Doc. 149)-----	3,700
1950-----	360,400
1951-----	412,200

¹ CLERK'S NOTE.—\$9,000 of this amount was rescinded by the Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1949.

Arbitration and emergency boards (National Mediation Board)

Appropriations:

1946-----	\$100,000
Deficiency-----	23,900
Deficiency (second, 1946)-----	37,500
1947-----	110,000
Supplemental (Public, 36)-----	60,800
1948-----	119,000
Supplemental (Public, 519)-----	48,800
1949-----	100,000
Deficiency (Public, 119)-----	36,900
1950-----	100,000
Supplemental (Public, 430)-----	75,000

Estimates:

1946-----	100,000
Deficiency (H. Doc. 296)-----	23,900
Deficiency (H. Doc. 481)-----	37,500
1947-----	110,000
Supplemental (H. Doc. 62)-----	60,800
1948-----	119,000
Supplemental (S. Doc. 138)-----	48,800
1949-----	100,000
Deficiency (S. Doc. 38)-----	36,900
1950-----	100,000
Supplemental (Doc. 350)-----	75,000
1951-----	150,000

National Railroad Adjustment Board (National Mediation Board)

CLERK'S NOTE.—The items "Salaries and expenses" and "Printing and binding" were consolidated in 1950 into a single "Salaries and expenses" appropriation for the National Railroad Adjustment Board. Following is a

combined statement of appropriations and estimates for these items in prior years:

Appropriations:

1942-----	\$224,530
1943-----	239,560
1944-----	253,000
1945-----	289,500
1946-----	203,750
1947-----	316,500
Supplemental (Public, 46)-----	21,500
1949-----	412,000
1949-----	422,200
Deficiency (Public, 119)-----	37,600
1950-----	468,100
Supplemental (Public, 343)-----	207,700

Estimates:

1942-----	230,870
1943-----	253,760
1944-----	253,000
1945-----	289,500
1946-----	293,750
1947-----	317,900
Supplemental (H. Doc. 62)-----	21,500
1948-----	420,600
1949-----	422,200
Deficiency (Doc. 93)-----	37,600
1950-----	468,100
Supplemental (Doc. 218)-----	207,700
1951-----	797,300

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, as to the railroad retirement account—Railroad Retirement Board, in 1942 it had \$140,850,000. In 1950 it had \$748,889,000. The salaries and expenses of the Railroad Retirement Board trust fund in 1942 were \$3,150,000, and in 1950 were \$5,104,000. There is a note in connection with the 1950 figure, "Direct from trust fund rather than general fund."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these tables may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Railroad Retirement Account—Railroad Retirement Board

Appropriations:

1942-----	\$140,850,000
1943-----	214,801,000
1944-----	262,720,000
1945-----	308,817,000
1946-----	291,913,000
1947-----	298,233,000
1948-----	665,072,000
1949-----	637,986,000
1950-----	\$748,889,000

Estimates:

1942-----	140,850,000
1943-----	214,801,000
1944-----	262,720,000
1945-----	308,817,000
1946-----	291,913,000
1947-----	298,233,000
1948-----	\$685,072,000
1949-----	637,986,000
1950-----	² 715,889,000
1951-----	² 594,000,000

¹ As revised by H. Doc. 161.

² Annual indefinite proposal.

³ Definite appropriation amount. In addition, see provisions of act appropriating funds for certain years beyond 1950 for military service credits.

Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (Trust Fund)

CLERK'S NOTE.—The 1950 act provided that beginning in 1950 the Board's administrative expense needs under the retirement program be met directly from the trust fund rather than by direct general Treasury appropriation and subsequent reimbursement from tax collections prior to their appropriation. The following table of prior year direct general Treasury appropriations and

estimates is shown for purposes of comparing with prior years:

Appropriations:

1942.....	\$3, 150, 000
1943.....	3, 041, 000
1944.....	2, 554, 000
1945.....	2, 499, 000
1946.....	2, 558, 000
Deficiency (Second, 1946)....	170, 000
1947.....	3, 036, 000
Supplemental (Public, 46) ..	1, 853, 000
1948.....	5, 659, 000
1949.....	4, 398, 000
Deficiency (Public, 119)....	545, 950
1950.....	5, 104, 000

Estimates:

1942.....	3, 169, 770
1943.....	3, 041, 000
1944.....	2, 554, 000
1945.....	2, 499, 000
1946.....	2, 558, 000
Deficiency (H. Doc. 419)....	219, 000
1947.....	3, 039, 800
Supplemental (H. Doc. 90) ..	2, 166, 000
1948.....	5, 659, 000
1949.....	4, 398, 000
Deficiency (Docs. 93, 149)...	629, 950
1950.....	5, 104, 000
1951.....	5, 446, 000

¹ As revised by H. Doc. 161.

² Direct from trust fund rather than general fund.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the next is salaries and expenses, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service. In 1948 the appropriations were \$1,320,000, and a supplemental appropriation of \$850,000. In 1950, the appropriations were \$2,700,000.

Mr. President, I ask that the tables in connection with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service may be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service

Appropriations:

1948 (Supplemental).....	\$1, 320, 000
Supp. (Public, 430).....	850, 000
1949.....	2, 940, 000
1950 (Public, 343).....	2, 700, 000

Estimates:

1948 (H. Doc. 386).....	2, 500, 000
Supp. (H. Doc. 502).....	950, 000
1949.....	2, 940, 000
1950.....	2, 740, 000
1951.....	2, 949, 700

Boards of inquiry, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service

Appropriations:

1948 (Supplemental).....	\$90, 000
1949.....	150, 000
1950 (Public, 343).....	25, 000

Estimates:

1948 (H. Doc. 386).....	150, 000
1949.....	150, 000
1950.....	75, 000
1951.....	50, 000

FOREIGN COMMERCE—SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the Senate has transferred about every responsibility it has placed upon it under the Constitution, except voting appropriations from taxpayers' money for the President of the United States.

Much time is consumed in complaining of the President's power, but that power is the result of action taken by the Senate. The action taken by the Senate in extending for two more years the power of the President and the Sec-

retary of State over the regulation of foreign commerce is a good example.

The Congress of the United States is directly charged by the Constitution with this job, but by transferring it to the President, any real work the Senate has to do under the Constitution is practically eliminated. The Senate then can spend most of an afternoon debating a reduction of about \$11,000,000 out of a \$2,000,000,000 appropriation, and talk a couple of hours about the importance of certain funds that amount to \$8,000,000 and \$15,000,000, respectively, out of a two and a half billion dollars appropriation.

But, Mr. President, when the Senate of the United States eliminates most of its work and spends its time discussing less than one-half of 1 percent of the appropriation, it has lost its significance. The people of the country would like to see the Senate of the United States, that great body of men, that most exclusive club in the world, take back its authority from the President of the United States with which it is charged by the Constitution, and go to work.

**APPRAISAL OF ECONOMIC SITUATION—
LETTER FROM COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC
ADVISERS TO THE PRESIDENT**

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which was sent to the President by the Council of Economic Advisers. The President read the letter to the Democratic and Republican members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee at a conference at the White House this afternoon.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 5, 1951.

The PRESIDENT,

*The White House,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is in response to your request that we set forth very briefly an up-to-the-minute appraisal of the economic situation and outlook. The question uppermost in many minds is whether the events of the last few weeks mark the disappearance of inflationary dangers. Our judgment is that inflationary pressures in the months and year ahead will be stronger than any yet confronted since the initial Korean outbreak. Consequently, we advise that an even stronger anti-inflationary program will be needed to contain these rising pressures.

The Council has often stressed the fallacy of placing too much weight upon very short interruptions in a general trend. Even when our economy is in a sustained and powerful upward movement, it does not proceed in an absolutely straight line. There are minor ups and downs in the line, even in the course of a general climb.

You will recall that, even during the softening of the economy in 1949, the Council's study of all the underlying factors led to the conclusion that the upward movement would soon be vigorously resumed. And this occurred well before the new international developments.

The so-called softening which some detect in the economy of today cannot be compared in extent or significance with that which occurred in 1949, and today the fundamental impulses toward more inflation are far more dominant. In fact, the Council's

regular quarterly report to you at the end of the first quarter of this year indicated that, in view of the extraordinary speculative accumulations of inventories which had been under way, "some liquidation may take place, easing the immediate pressure." But we coupled this statement with the finding that this would be a short and relatively insignificant wavering in the strongly inflationary trend.

What has happened in the most recent weeks can hardly be called even a temporary softening of the over-all economy, although there have been rather spectacular developments in a few limited areas. The over-all economic situation today is very tight, indeed. Industrial production is at the peak reached since World War II. Steel is operating several percentage points above rated capacity. Unemployment is at the lowest levels reached since World War II. The most recent figures indicate that incomes of all major types have risen much more rapidly than production, and this trend, if unrestrained, promises more spending and more inflation, even if for a few weeks business or consumers have adopted a wait-and-see attitude.

On top of this very tight economic situation we must continue to superimpose a rapidly expanding defense program. Before the middle of next year the annual rate of expenditures for national security will be more than twice as high as the current annual rate. This means an increase of more than \$30,000,000,000 at an annual rate. This stark fact alone, made necessary by the world situation, is in itself compelling evidence that inflationary pressures will mount.

Another increased inflationary pressure will arise because the budgetary surplus of recent months will be replaced by a growing deficit, due to the rapid acceleration of defense outlays. This would be true for some time, even if there were now prompt enactment of the entire new tax program which you have proposed to the Congress.

Still another inflationary pressure will result because the total of all kinds of income is going to increase greatly during the coming months, at a time when the supply of civilian goods cannot be correspondingly increased. Even with an effective stabilization program, more employment, longer hours, some adjustments in prices and wages, and the expansion of defense production and necessary supporting production, will swell the total volume of incomes of all kinds. Without an effective stabilization program, the increase in private demand between now and the early part of next year could be as great or greater than the increase in necessary defense outlays. If both of these things should happen at the same time, the inflationary results would seriously weaken the structure of the economy.

In weighing the effect that more inflation would have upon the defense program, upon business confidence, upon the condition of the American dollar, and—most important of all—upon the morale of the American people, we must bear in mind what has already happened. Since the initial Korean outbreak a year ago, wholesale prices have increased about 16 percent, the cost of living has increased about 8½ percent, and food prices more than 11 percent. The spot market prices of 28 key commodities have increased more than 34 percent. The increases of some commodity prices have been fantastic. Wool tops have increased 55 percent, tin 78 percent, and natural rubber 134 percent. And all of this came on top of a serious inflationary movement between 1946 and 1949. These figures mean that we now have no margin of safety in tolerating more inflation.

To meet this menace of inflation clearly requires a rounded and vigorous program. It requires even more tax increases than have

thus far been proposed to the Congress, although we appreciate the economic soundness of making these proposals in a series of steps instead of all at once. The containment of inflation also requires the continuation of restraints upon inflationary credit. It requires enlarged savings. It requires reasonable restraints upon profits, wages, and other forms of income, because if incomes grow too rapidly there will be no way of holding spending down to safe levels. It requires firm stabilization of prices and the cost of living, because without such stabilization there will be no way to prevent both profits and wages from getting out of hand. It requires also continuation and improvement of the production aids contained in the Defense Production Act, because in the long run the expansion of production is a fundamental approach to the shortages which breed inflation.

The most compelling evidence that a well-rounded program can protect the country against further inflation is that the program thus far enacted by the Congress and applied by the executive branch has already produced substantial results. Since the General Ceiling Price Regulation went into effect in February, wholesale prices have increased less than 1 percent, and since a month ago they have actually declined slightly. The latest indications are that consumer prices have leveled off. The spot market prices of 28 important commodities have declined almost 7½ percent since the General Ceiling Price Regulation, and the decline has continued during the past few weeks. Many other examples could be cited, for example, in the credit and construction field.

It is idle and even dangerous to speculate as to which of these programs has done most to help get inflation under control. The vital fact is that these programs, all taken together, have been authorized and applied to fight inflation—and taken together, they have already achieved considerable success in his fight against inflation. There is no use guessing what might have happened under different circumstances when we know what has actually happened under actual circumstances.

This points up to the conclusion that no one measure, and no two or three measures, can alone do the job of controlling inflation. We need all of the necessary measures so that they can be used in effective combination. For example, the tax increases already enacted had to be reinforced by price and wage stabilization to achieve the progress thus far made in bringing inflation under control. We should not abandon even some of the necessary measures when the dangers ahead are even greater than those of the recent past.

The greater dangers ahead do not mean that we must have more inflation. They do mean that we will have more inflation if we relax our efforts, or fail to strengthen the weak links in the chain of effective controls. The economic outlook calls for a stronger anti-inflationary program, using both indirect and direct controls to safeguard us in the trying months and years immediately ahead. In 2 years or so, if the international situation does not worsen, the expansion of our productive ability should enable us to relax or do away with the kinds of controls which none of us likes in peacetime.

Respectfully yours,

LEON T. KEYSERLING,
Chairman.
JOHN D. CLARK,
ROY BLOUGH.

MARITIME MATTERS—LETTER FROM
HOYT S. HADDOCK TO EDWARD KEATING,
EDITOR OF LABOR

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter written

to Mr. Edward Keating, editor of Labor, from Hoyt S. Haddock, executive secretary of the CIO Maritime Committee. The letter relates to an article by Mr. Keating, published in one of the editions of Labor, appearing in a section called "News of Congress," in which he discusses certain parts of the debate regarding maritime matters and the supplemental appropriation bill of 1951. Apparently Labor had a mistaken impression as to what the facts were in the matter, and I therefore ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD so that the facts may be made clear.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIO MARITIME COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., May 31, 1951.

Mr. EDWARD KEATING,
Editor, Labor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. KEATING: I am writing you to clarify several of the statements contained in an article in your issue of May 26, 1951. The story in question, entitled "Shipowners Lost Struggle To Prevent Curb on Profits," appears under the byline of Alfred M. Green, in the section "News of Congress." The challenged statements are taken from one side of the debate in the House on the supplemental appropriation bill for 1951.

Before dealing with the inaccurate statements appearing in the article, I believe it advisable to call your attention to the fact that the CIO Maritime Committee has constantly advocated, and will continue to advocate, the adoption of legislation which will take the profit out of war. We were following this principle in 1946 when we urged that a provision be inserted in the Ship Sales Act of 1946 reserving to the Government the unlimited right to reacquire the World War II surplus vessels sold under the act at the sales price, less depreciation, plus any improvements placed on them by the purchasers. Congress saw fit to disregard our proposal.

The vessels were sold without a contractual provision limiting the price to be paid if the Government found it necessary to reacquire the ships. In the absence of such a contractual provision the Government, in accord with the provision of the fifth amendment to the Constitution, is legally bound to pay just compensation for the requisition of the ships for title or use. This situation was fully discussed before the appropriate congressional committees considering the Ship Sales Act and during the debates in both Houses. In the light of the then controlling economic factors, Congress decided to sell surplus ships on a basis comparable to the sales of other surplus war materials.

An examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will disclose that the Congressman and many proponents of the Thomas proposal referred to in the article voted to pass the Ship Sales Act and to approve the conference report of a bill that was far less restrictive than the sales measure originally passed by the House (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 92, pt. 2, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 1650).

To attempt at this late date to retroactively limit the payment of just compensation only to American purchasers of World War II surplus vessels and not place any comparable restriction on foreign shipowners who acquired our surplus war vessels is discriminatory and unjust to the American citizen who legally purchased in good faith. Approximately 800 ships were sold for operation under the American flag. The prohibition of the Thomas amendment would apply to these ships. About 1,100 vessels were sold for foreign-flag operation. These would escape.

In the article it is emphasized "that Senator JOHN H. WILLIAMS carried on the fight

but was less successful." May I call your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 8, 1951 (82d Cong., 2d sess., p. 5146), that during the course of the debate on the Thomas proposal, it appears that the legislative counsel of the Senate gave an opinion that the proviso was unconstitutional in its application to the ship purchasers. This opinion is shared by all other attorneys with whom I have discussed the matter.

The article indicates Congressman THOMAS cited several examples of alleged unconscionable profits made by shipowners during World War II and proceeds to detail one such transaction. There is no doubt that during times of national emergency shipowners realize large profits. This is true for all industries. The cited transaction, however, does not disclose all of the pertinent facts. Reference is made to charter hire paid by the Government in the sum of \$1,043,000. The inference is that the entire sum constitutes profit. This is not true. Our investigation of the facts is that the owner of the vessel in question (steamship *Alcoa Leader*) received "time charter hire" in the above amount for a period of about 2½ years. Under the time form of charter, the owner must pay the direct operating expenses of the vessel. Direct operating costs, generally computed at 70 percent of the vessel income, are divided as follows:

	Percent
Wages	42
Subsistence	6
Maintenance and repairs	8
Hull and machinery insurance	7
Stores and supplies	5
Miscellaneous	2

Direct operating costs do not include overhead, depreciation, taxes, or profit. A review of the hearings held by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee during the Seventy-eighth Congress shows that charter rates (time and bareboat) were fixed at a level to provide a reasonable return to the owner, generally considered to be 10 percent (H. Doc. 20A, 78th Cong., 2d sess.). This profit is much less than the general level of profit realized by other industries.

A further omission of a material fact appears in connection with the sale of the vessel for \$210,000 and the payment of \$435,307 for the loss of the ship. The implication is that the owner made \$225,307 at the expense of the Government. The figures are correct. The fact that is concealed is that the loss was covered by a Government policy of war-risk insurance for which policy the vessel owner paid premiums computed at a rate based on a declared value and in accordance with sound actuarial schedules. In other words, the Government as insurer paid an insurance loss.

That the writing of marine war-risk insurance was good business for the Government is conclusively shown in a report of the Comptroller General. In the audit entitled "Report on Audit of United States Maritime Commission for the Fiscal Years Ended June 30, 1948 and 1949" (H. Doc. 465, 81st Cong., 2d sess.) the Comptroller General (p. 73) shows a profit to the Government of \$127,285,014 from this operation.

My motive in presenting the foregoing facts is solely to clear the record. I am certain that Mr. Green and your newspaper accepted the statements appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at face value. You had every right to do so. Unfortunately the statements did not tell the whole story.

In the past our two organizations have cooperated fully in matters of common interest. We have also exchanged information and facts prior to taking a position on legislation or matters of interest in our particular fields. I trust that these cordial relations will continue in the future.

Fraternalty yours,

HOYT S. HADDOCK,
Executive Secretary.

unfortunate that the publishers of Time magazine saw fit to print this story at this time. Had it been used 8 months ago, the description of conditions prevailing at Pickett would largely have been accurate.

The Forty-third Division was called into Federal service last September and ordered to Camp Pickett for training. During the first 2 or 3 months there was a state of great confusion. The camp itself was completely unready for occupancy. Supplies of all kinds, even proper food, were lacking for the first few weeks. The post was overcrowded within a short time. Arrangements for family dependency allowances were faulty and many families did not receive their allotments for weeks or months after the men were called into service. Members of Congress from Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Vermont received hundreds of complaints about conditions at Camp Pickett.

The situation which prevailed at that time, however, was in no way the fault of the Forty-third Division or its officers. The Pentagon had simply ordered the men into Federal service without making preparations to receive them. This situation can be multiplied many times over.

When the Forty-third was ordered into Federal service, it was generally believed that the United States might become involved in world war III within a few months time. The commanding general of the division, Maj. Gen. Kenneth F. Cramer, was directed to have his men ready for combat service in 28 weeks.

Possibly with a view to toughening his men in the least possible time, General Cramer issued many restrictive orders. Some of these orders appeared to be petty and childish restrictions which were strongly resented by the men of the Forty-third. Opportunities of the men to visit their families in nearby towns were severely restricted, although the general himself did not comply with the order which limited the opportunity of his men to be with their families. The fact that the general's own family was ensconced upon the post grounds probably resulted in more dissatisfaction among his officers and men than did any other cause. It was only natural that the men of the Forty-third Division resented any order issued by the commanding general which he himself was not willing to observe.

During the time the Forty-third Division has been at Camp Pickett, I have been in almost daily communication with members of this division. Early this spring I spent a day at the camp, having meals with the men and talking with possibly a hundred different members of this division. I am happy to say that the food at Camp Pickett appears to be excellent, that the training the men have received is good, as reported by men far more familiar with military practices than I am. This is evidenced by the fact that already considerable numbers of officers and men have been sent into service in the Pacific area.

The restrictions originally imposed upon the men have been somewhat

eased. The morale of the division, at least as far as the One Hundred and Seventy-second Vermont Regiment is concerned, is quite high—as high as can be expected from any group of men who have left their homes and businesses to spend months in an Army training camp. Recreational facilities still appear to be inadequate and there seems to be a considerable shortage of ordinary equipment.

On the whole, the Forty-third Division appears to be amply able to defend its tradition. No division of the American Armed Forces made a more glorious record during World War II than did the Forty-third Division in its progress from Guadalcanal to the Philippines under the leadership of a truly great Vermonter, Maj. Gen. Leonard F. Wing.

As for the Time magazine reference to the appellation of "cry-baby division" which the Pentagon is rumored to have applied to the Forty-third, I had not heard of such name calling until the article appeared in Time magazine. That name calling within the services does exist would not be surprising. It is common knowledge that professional military men look down upon National Guard men. It is common knowledge that Major General Cramer is not, and has not been in favor with the top levels at the Pentagon.

It is my understanding that shortly after the termination of hostilities in World War II a directive was issued by the service departments prohibiting the practice of name calling within the services. This directive, I understand, was brought about by the use of the term "trade-school boys" as applied to graduates of our service academies. I have called the attention of Secretary Pace to the premise that prohibition against name calling should be a two-way proposition.

It is also common knowledge, as has been strongly evidenced during recent weeks, that our Military Establishment, from the Commander in Chief down, strongly resents a freedom of expression or communication with members of Congress by members of the Armed Forces. It is an indisputable fact, however, that our Armed Forces today are in much better condition than they would have been had the men in service not communicated with their Senators and Representatives in Congress.

The extremely deplorable conditions existing at the Lackland Air Base and the correction of such conditions following an investigation by an Armed Forces Subcommittee of the Senate is a striking example of this.

When the time comes that men and officers in the armed services cannot communicate with Members of Congress, then we may consider that democracy in America has come to an end.

TROUBLES STEMMING FROM TEHRAN AND YALTA—STATEMENT BY JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Mr. James A. Farley says that the problems of the world stem from Tehran and Yalta. He addressed the graduating class at St. Anselm's College at Manchester, N. H., on June 8. An Associated

Press dispatch reporting this statement reads, in part, as follows:

James A. Farley, a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, said today it is his "solemn conviction that many of the problems besetting the world would not be with us if we had a vigorous, alert, and forceful leader at Tehran and Yalta."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARLEY SAYS PROBLEMS OF WORLD STEM FROM TEHRAN AND YALTA

MANCHESTER, N. H., June 8.—James A. Farley, a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, said today it is his "solemn conviction that many of the problems besetting the world would not be with us if we had had a vigorous, alert, and forceful leader at Tehran and Yalta."

Speaking at St. Anselm's College commencement, the former Postmaster General said:

"There the peace was lost while we were winning the war. And the peace was lost because our leader (President Roosevelt) was no longer the gallant warrior against fear, but a weary, overburdened man who had given his all in a supreme effort to not only solve the problems of our Nation but of the world."

"We all know that there is a limit to the endurance of body and mind—and for 16 years, starting in 1929, our late President carried a back-breaking, heart-breaking burden in Albany and Washington. It was a miracle that he was able to carry on physically and mentally throughout that long period."

The former National Democratic Committee chairman said that "in the vital realm of politics * * * it is essential that the torch of leadership be passed on to others, preferably to younger men."

"If younger men are not trained step by step to take over leadership there is danger that the race may be set back or lost," he added.

"Leaders do not spring full grown into public office * * * but must patiently climb to eminences of trust through accomplished performance in positions of trust whether private or public."

Mr. Farley said that he opposed a third term for the President in 1940 because he feared Mr. Roosevelt was "listening to courtiers and coat-tail riders."

"I could see nothing but danger to the party and to the Nation by continued occupancy of office in contradiction to the expressed wisdom of founding fathers. I was impelled by deep conviction to take the course of opposition. I knew it was a losing fight, but felt that the fight had to be made."

"Every passing day, especially as I look upon a world torn by strife, has convinced me that I was right. I do not rejoice in my rightness. I would rather be wrong and the world happier."

St. Anselm's conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws on Mr. Farley.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Byrd	Dirksen
Bennett	Cain	Duff
Benton	Capehart	Dworshak
Brewster	Chavez	Eastland
Bridges	Clements	Eaton
Butler, Md.	Connally	Ellender
Butler, Nebr.	Cordon	Ferguson

Frear	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Knowland	Pastore
George	Langer	Robertson
Gillette	Lehman	Russell
Green	Long	Saltonstall
Hayden	Malone	Schoeppel
Hendrickson	McCarran	Smathers
Hennings	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Hickenlooper	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Hill	McFarland	Smith, N. C.
Hoey	McKellar	Sparkman
Holland	McMahon	Stennis
Hunt	Monroney	Thye
Ives	Moody	Underwood
Jenner	Morse	Watkins
Johnson, Colo.	Mundt	Welker
Johnson, Tex.	Neely	Wherry
Johnston, S. C.	Nixon	Williams
Kerr	O'Connor	Young

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has asked me to announce that he is absent from the Senate today because of the necessity of filling a long-standing commitment to speak at the annual meeting of the board of the United Seamen's Service in New York. This commitment was made over 3 weeks ago.

As most Senators know, United Seamen's Service is an organization dedicated to the welfare of American merchant seamen throughout the world. Through this organization, management and labor have sought to provide in the most important ports of the world centers where seamen can meet their friends or spend leisure hours in a wholesome atmosphere.

It is one of the most commendable efforts undertaken by the shipping industry for the welfare of our merchant seamen.

Within the past few months this organization has staffed, equipped, and opened a center in Japan.

It was only logical that the Board of Directors of the United Seamen's Service should request the Senator from Washington to appear as chief speaker at their annual meeting being held in New York today, as he is one of the outstanding members of the Congress on merchant marine matters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senators from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER and Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee which reported this bill, I fully realize and appreciate the fact that the Senate is passing on the bill, but I wish all 96 Senators to realize what is before them before they take action. For that reason, I have prepared a short statement in regard to the effect of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan.

I want all Senators to realize that the budget estimates for all agencies embraced in this bill amount to \$2,744,253,760, approximately \$270,000,000 more than was appropriated for the current fiscal year for these purposes. I should like to have all Senators to follow these figures with me.

The substantial increase in the estimates over the 1951 appropriations is explained, first, by the abandonment of the contract authority provisions, for which in the 1951 bill there was provision for \$100,000,000-plus, whereas in this bill the provision for new obligatory authority is in the form of cash; second, by the increase of \$124,000,000-plus for payment to the railroad retirement trust fund; and, third, by a \$20,000,000 increase requested for public assistance.

By the way, Mr. President, the committee has recommended \$150,000,000 less than the amount of the estimate for grants for public assistance.

Of the total of \$2,744,253,760, in excess of \$2,500,000,000 is for grants and benefits. Senators should not think that all of the \$2,744,000,000 is payroll funds. I want Senators to understand the facts about these matters, and then do what they think is proper and fit. If Senators wish to cut these funds by 10 percent, that is up to them; but, first, they should understand what the Senate is acting on.

As I have just said, \$2,500,000,000 of the total amount is for grants to States for administration of the employment services and unemployment compensation programs; for grants for public assistance; for the employees' compensation fund; for hospital construction; for school construction, maintenance, and

operation; for grants dealing with public health matters; and for payments to the railroad retirement trust fund. The total for these purposes is \$2,577,431,968.

One hundred and ninety-nine million eight hundred and twenty-eight thousand and seven hundred and eight dollars is for the Department of Labor. When compared to the total amount of appropriations carried in this bill, the appropriation for the Department of Labor is infinitesimal.

One billion seven hundred and sixty-four million six hundred and three thousand two hundred and sixty dollars is for the Federal Security Agency.

Six hundred and thirteen million dollars is for the Railroad Retirement Board.

On Friday, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said the committee has made very minor reductions in the appropriations carried in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives; he said that the \$112,867,530 by which the committee has voted to reduce the allowances made by the House is of little moment. Mr. President, the bill as reported to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee carries appropriations amounting to \$112,000,000 less than the allowances made by the House of Representatives. When a reduction of \$112,000,000 is made in the committee, I do not think it can be said that such a reduction is of very little moment.

Let us reflect on the charges made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. Is it not fair to say that the contention made by the senior Senator from Illinois was that these were actually bookkeeping transactions, rather than reductions in fact in the budget, and that they represented adjustments which could have been made next year or the year after that?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; we are talking about Uncle Sam's dollars, \$112,000,000 of them.

Mr. BENTON. But the contention of the Senator from Illinois was, if I properly understood him—he is not now on the floor, and that is the only reason why I rise to ask the question—that these were bookkeeping adjustments which could be made 2 years or 3 years from now or at any other time in the future, and are not, in fact, reductions in expenditures.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. Of course, they could be made 2 years or 3 years or 10 years from now, but the fact remains that the committee did it now.

Mr. BENTON. I am sorry the Senator from Illinois is not here to interpret his speech, but that is the way I understood it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I remember when the Senator from Connecticut sought to have an appropriation made for civil-defense activities, and at that time he did not think so much about economy. However, when it comes to a question of allowing sufficient funds for a hospital or for cancer research or for mental health ac-

tivities, the Senator from Connecticut is very economical. I am glad of that; that is all right.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator has understood my question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I decline to yield at the moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us now reflect on the charges of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, let me ask the able Senator from New Mexico whether both the subcommittee and the full committee carefully considered the subject which the Senate is now discussing?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only did we do that, but the Senator would be surprised to know that nine members of the committee privately, in the committee room, voted to report the bill. Notwithstanding that, only the other day nine members of the committee voted for cuts in the appropriation. That, of course, is their own business, and no one is complaining about it, except that I desire to give them a little factual information. The committee cut repeatedly. As a general rule, as the Senator from West Virginia knows, it is expected that the Senate committee will restore cuts made by the House. In this instance, we cut \$112,000,000 more than did the House.

Mr. NEELY. Is it not true that the Senator from New Mexico and his subcommittee also decided, in effect, that the matter to which the Senator from Connecticut has referred is one of reality instead of bookkeeping hocus pocus?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, in the circumstances, since the Senator from Connecticut, in defending the opposing argument made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has indicated that it is so incomprehensible that the Senator from Connecticut, even with his unlimited education and unsurpassable ability, is unable to interpret it without the assistance of its eminent author, I must support the committee's comprehensible, logical, and impressive recommendation instead of the amendment which is designed to impair it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, let us now reflect on the charges of the Senator from Illinois. The total estimates for grants and benefits, not merely grants and benefits to Alabama, Connecticut, Illinois, Arizona, New York, New Mexico, or Arkansas but the total grants and benefits—and I repeat, we are not now talking about payrolls—are, as I outlined before, \$2,577,431,968, leaving for all other objects of expenditure—that is, for travel, personal services, communications, the transportation of things, for rents and utility services, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, supplies and materials, equipment, and for taxes and assessments—a grand total of \$166,000,000 plus. I repeat that the appropriation for grants to the 48 States

and our possessions is \$2,577,431,968, while for personal service and other objectives, to carry on the functions of Government as provided in laws which we have passed, the appropriation is only \$166,000,000. Had we disallowed all requests for funds for these items, we would have saved \$166,000,000, compared with the estimates. But we reported a bill appropriating \$215,000,000 under the estimates, which to the Senator from Illinois is a minor savings. Possibly it is a minor saving; but after complete hearings to determine the amounts necessary in order to carry on the functions of Government, or at least in order to enable it to try to function, and in order to have the various branches of the Government do what they say should be done, we allowed a sum which is \$215,000,000 under the estimates. Perhaps the strongest objection to the committee action is that it left for some of our vocal proponents of economy very little ground for public demonstrations.

The committee instructed the Department to tell us where to cut, informing them that, if they did not tell us where to cut, the committee would do the cutting. But it appears that the only way by which it is possible to save money is to allow the amounts of the budget figures, and then refer the matter to the Senate, and let the Senate make whatever reductions it may see fit. But when we provided \$215,000,000 under the estimates, I submit that when any Senator says that very little was done in the matter of saving money his statement is not well taken.

The committee held lengthy hearings, deliberated for more than a week before the full committee on the individual items, and finally reported a bill \$215,000,000 under the estimates, and \$112,000,000 under the appropriations provided by the House. I ask Senators who have been in this body for some time, When has it occurred before that the Senate Appropriations Committee has not restored cuts made by the House? But in this instance not only did we restore them but we reduced the figures of the House bill \$112,000,000. What more can be expected of a committee?

After all, the Government must carry on. Of course, it would be possible for us to save the entire amount. We could save the entire amount, but I ask Senators, do we not desire to do our duty? We took an oath of office that we would, under the Constitution, do certain things, including providing funds for the operation of the Government. Yes; it would be possible to save every penny appropriated by this bill, but would that be desirable? On the contrary, do we not want to carry on the orderly processes of government, without waste?

The full committee deliberated for more than a week on the individual items, and finally approved a bill appropriating \$215,000,000 less than the estimate of the Budget Bureau and \$112,000,000 less than contained in the bill as passed by the House. It appears now that it would have been better, had the bill not been referred to the committee, but, instead, placed on the calendar to

be considered on the floor of the Senate, to be subjected to delicate surgical operations on the part of advocates of economy, provided the move for economy is publicized, so that due credit may be received by Members on this floor. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was presented to the full committee, where it received some support. The Senator gave notice that he would offer such an amendment from the floor. That was entirely proper, and there is no complaint in that regard.

But there was no move in the committee to allow a lesser amount for the two items already reduced by floor action—the immediate office of the Secretary of Labor, and the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor. For the office of the Secretary the estimate was \$1,475,000, of which the House allowed \$1,425,000, and the committee \$1,400,000. I repeat, no member of the committee suggested that more should have been cut from this allowance. For the Office of Solicitor, the estimate was \$1,750,000, of which the House allowed \$1,650,000. The subcommittee, of which I am chairman, allowed an increase of \$50,000, or \$1,700,000. The full committee first disagreed to this raise, by a tie vote, but on reconsideration the subcommittee action was approved, allowing \$1,700,000. There was not one word spoken to advocate less than the House allowance. Yet, the Senate on Friday, by a vote of 47 yeas to 29 nays, agreed to a motion to reduce the appropriation for the Solicitor's Office to \$1,575,000.

I find that nine members of the Committee on Appropriations voted in the affirmative, but none of them stated that they felt that too much was being allowed to the Office of the Solicitor. I have no complaint about that. All I am doing today is to advise the Senate about it. I believe in the majority of this body controlling matters. Even if it is against a committee recommendation, I am in favor of majority rule.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the junior Senator from Rhode Island correct in assuming that the subcommittee has already reduced the appropriation by 5 percent?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The subcommittee, joined in by the full committee, is recommending that kind of an amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is to the effect that 5 percent of the payroll items be deducted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. That does not include hospital services.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are trying to make an exception of them. I think the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is trying to make an exception in that case.

Mr. PASTORE. While it may be a very expeditious way of accomplishing the result, what is the logic in recommending a reduction across the board? I am not trying to be critical at all; I

am seeking information. There may be some offices in the Department which have 20 percent more help than they need. We would tolerate in such an office a 15 percent overstaffing, but there might be other offices which were understaffed. It strikes me that that is a very unwise way of reducing personnel appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is not a question of whether it is even sound. I agree completely with the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island, but I still believe in supporting committee action. The committee approved the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to place a cut of 5 percent on the payrolls as to individual items. The Senator did not want to have the amendment apply to the public health items. They are the only ones that would have been protected. But, outside those exceptions, the cut is 5 percent. The committee reported the Cordon amendment, and I think that is as far as we should go. That is why I am objecting to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that would make a cut of 10 percent.

Mr. PASTORE. If I correctly understand the senior Senator from New Mexico, he takes the position that that would render the whole program ineffective.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would appear to me to mean complete ruination.

Mr. PASTORE. If we sacrifice 5 percent we do not render it ineffective. Why does the addition of 5 percent to the 5-percent cut recommended by the committee make all the difference?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It makes this difference: It would impose a limitation on the amount of money that could be used for the services affected. Under the Cordon amendment each and every item in the bill is cut 5 percent. As between the two amendments, the Senator from New Mexico feels that the one providing for a 5-percent cut is sounder. I did not agree, but the committee did, that we should cut the items 5 percent, but something had to be done, and the committee took that action. I feel that a cut of 10 percent would be not only unsound, but would be ruinous in the effort to carry on the functions of Government.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In a moment.

It seems to me that the holding of lengthy hearings on appropriation bills is a meaningless task, and that the subcommittee markup and the full committee markup are a waste of time, if the recommendations of the committee are not to be followed. As the markups are in executive session, perhaps due notice is not given of motions to reduce appropriations. It cost \$1,996.40, just under \$2,000, for the stenographic report and transcription of our hearings. It cost not less than \$15,000 to have printed 750 volumes of the hearings, consisting of 1,232 pages.

Mr. President, I make these few remarks, without complaining about what the Senate may do, but, in reflecting upon the action of the Senate on Friday, and what appears to be a foregone con-

clusion of what will happen today, I have come to the conclusion that it is useless to spend time in committee on these bills. Members make no objection to the approval of an amount for a particular item, but in the well of the Senate, under the eyes of the press and the public, support is given to cuts proposed from the floor.

I know what the Senator from Michigan has in mind. He wants to cut waste, as does the Senator from New Mexico. But there is such a thing as cutting improperly. Of course we can cut the number of employees on the floor of the Senate; we do not have to appropriate for them. But could the Government efficiently carry on? Of course we can cut the number of Senate pages. Of course we can cut the number of elevator operators. Of course, we can make cuts in many instances. But that is not the point. Cuts should be made on a sound basis. We can cut the number of our office stenographers and save money, but does any Senator feel that if we should do that in the case of one who answers the mail and the requests from back home, we would operate as efficiently as we do? We should get away from waste, yes; I am in favor of that. But let us try to behave as persons with reason.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The question of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] was a practical one, and while I feel that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee gave a very plausible answer, I think it should also be said, especially in the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], that the question asked by the Senator from Rhode Island was asked scores of times by members of the full committee. The question was, "Why do it in this way?"

I desire to say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that the chairman of the subcommittee worked out a modified version of the Jensen amendment in an attempt to make it practical. That was very difficult to do, for the very reason stated by the Senator from Rhode Island, that there might be one bureau in a department which did not have sufficient personnel, and in another case there might be plenty of personnel. In the final analysis, I believe it was felt that if we cut the appropriation for the whole department 5 percent, the administrator could make allowances to meet the very problem suggested by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Even though many of us felt that a personnel cut was the way to accomplish the objective, it seemed that that was not so practical as the way which the Senator from New Mexico has discussed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Let me make another suggestion to the Senator from Rhode Island. The Jensen amendment is easy to understand. If through retirements, deaths, resignations, or otherwise, positions become vacant, under the Jensen amendment only one out of four such positions could be

filled. The subcommittee tried to devise a formula that would not be so violent, and we worked out a formula providing that only one out of every two vacancies should be filled. But, for the reason which the Senator from Rhode Island has called to our attention, we finally came to the conclusion that in order to leave some discretion as to what particular positions a department should fill—it might not need a stenographer, but an analyst, or it might not need an analyst, but a stenographer—we would make the cut in dollars and cents, and leave discretion to the particular department. It was finally decided that instead of filling one out of two or one out of four of the positions which became vacant, 5 percent for personnel should be deducted under the bill, and that it should be left to the department to decide how it would use the money it obtained.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. What formula was used in reaching the 5-percent figure?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The formula used in reaching the 5-percent figure is strictly one of limitation, that out of the total amount appropriated for personal services no more than 95 percent can be used for payment of employees. That was the formula which was used.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator from Rhode Island know that the reason some Senators supported the Cordon amendment—and I think I shall support the Ferguson amendment—was that the total saving in dollars and cents contemplated by the full application of the Jensen amendment would result in approximately a 10-percent reduction in appropriation for personnel. There was no measuring stick, as I understand, but it was thought that result might be accomplished. In order to go at least a part of the distance the committee accepted the 5-percent proposal. At least that was the basis on which I voted. There is no measuring stick so far as I know except in the minds of those who would like to see the Jensen amendment agreed to. It was their idea that the resultant saving, if advantage were taken of the Jensen amendment, might reduce the appropriations in dollars and cents by approximately 10 percent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we favor a saving. Of course, we do not want the personnel situation to be thrown out of gear in some particular places. We figure it would be best to save in dollars and cents without interfering with the administration, if the necessity should arise some time, of employing a stenographer or an analyst or some one for a classified position.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the Jensen amendment was not considered or recommended by the House subcommittee, and was not considered or recom-

mended by the full committee of the House?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. It was attached to the bill on the floor of the House.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On the floor; yes.

Mr. HILL. An examination of the RECORD will show there was very little debate and very little consideration given to it by the House. Is that not true?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. The subcommittee which is handling the bill at this moment did pay some attention to the matter, and made some suggestions. First, instead of one out of every four there would be one out of every two.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee interviewed and contacted the Comptroller's Office and the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And labored rather assiduously to try to modify the Jensen amendment so the personnel limitation could be worked out on a practical basis. This situation was encountered: It was stated that one office in the Department was more important than another, or that one office was short of help or long of help. The subcommittee was granted certain additional days to work out a practical formula.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Six days.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my opinion that the majority of the committee voted for the Cordon amendment because they felt in the final analysis it would be more practical. I will say that I voted for the Jensen amendment in an effort to make a saving.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. It was felt the Cordon amendment would result in less damage.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely wanted to obtain information. I did not wish to appear critical.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to

be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951.'"

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized and directed to provide emergency food relief assistance to India on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, including payment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the Government of India) of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources. The Administrator is directed and instructed that in his negotiations with the Government of India he shall, so far as practicable and possible, obtain for the United States the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of such materials particularly those found to be strategic and critical.

"SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act the President is authorized to utilize not in excess of \$190,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1952, of which sum (1) not less than \$100,000,000 shall be made available immediately from funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; and (2) \$90,000,000 shall be available from any balance of such funds unallotted and unobligated as of June 30, 1951: *Provided*, That if such amount unallotted and unobligated is less than \$90,000,000 an amount equal to the difference shall be obtained from the issuance of notes in such amount by the Administrator for the Economic Cooperation Administration, who is hereby authorized and directed to issue such notes from time to time during fiscal years 1951 and 1952 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to purchase such notes and, in making such purchases to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of any public debt issue pursuant to the Second Liberty Loan Act as amended: *And provided further*, That \$50,000,000 reserved by the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to section 1214 of Public Law 759 of the Eighty-first Congress from funds appropriated by that Act for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall not be available for purposes of this section.

"SEC. 4. (a) Funds made available for purposes of this Act shall be used only for the purchase of food grains or equivalents in the United States.

"(b) No procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this Act shall be made unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall find and certify that such procurement will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States.

"(c) The assistance provided under this Act shall be for the sole purpose of providing food grains, or equivalents, to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of flood, drought, and other conditions existing in India in 1950.

"(d) The assistance provided under this Act shall be provided under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, applicable to and consistent with the purposes of this Act.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to the extent that the President, after consultation with appropriate Government officials and representatives of private shipping, finds and proclaims that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for transportation of supplies made available under this Act,

the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate \$20,000,000 to the Department of Commerce, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, for activation and operation of vessels for such transportation, and these advances may be placed in any funds or accounts available for such purposes, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for these purposes: *Provided*, That pursuant to agreements made between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Commerce, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest not later than June 30, 1952, for such advances either from funds hereafter made available to the Department of Commerce for the activation and operation of vessels or, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, from receipts from vessel operations: *Provided further*, That pending such repayment receipts from vessel operations may be placed in such funds or accounts and used for activating and operating vessels.

"SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized to pay ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry in India of relief packages and supplies under the provisions of section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, including the relief packages and supplies of the American Red Cross. Funds now or hereafter available during the period ending June 30, 1952, for furnishing assistance under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, may be used to carry out the purposes of this section.

"SEC. 7. (a) Any sums payable by the Government of India, under the interest terms agreed to between the Government of India, the United States and the Government of India, on or before January 1, 1957 as interest on the principal of any debt incurred under this Act, and not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000, shall, when paid, be placed in a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, notwithstanding any other provisions of law to remain available until expended. This account shall be available to the Department of State for the following uses.

"(1) Studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities in the United States and in its Territories or possessions (A) for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of India, and (B) with the approval of appropriate agencies, institutions, or organizations in India, for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of the United States to participate in similar activities in India, including in both cases travel expenses, tuition, subsistence and other allowances and expenses incident to such activities; and

"(2) The selection, purchase, and shipment of (A) American scientific, technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of India, (B) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in India, and (C) the interchange of similar materials and equipment from India for higher education and research in the United States.

"(b) Funds made available in accordance with the provisions stated above may be used to defray costs of administering the program authorized herein.

"(c) Disbursements from the special deposit account shall be made by the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, upon vouchers duly certified by the Secretary

of State or by authorized certifying officers of the Department of State."

And the House agree to the same.

G. M. GILLETTE,
BRIEN MCMAHON,
J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
B. M. M. (proxy),
ALEXANDER WILEY,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JAMES P. RICHARDS,
A. A. RIBICOFF,
BROOKS HAYS,
JOHN M. VORYS,
LAWRENCE H. SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and to recall to the minds of the Members this particular measure, I shall make a brief statement.

On May 16 the Senate amended and passed Senate bill 872. The House of Representatives subsequently amended and passed the bill and asked for a conference.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Three or four Senators who are intensely interested in the measure are absent from the floor. Although a quorum call was had a short time ago, I ask the Senator from Iowa if he will yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, so it will not be necessary for him to repeat his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield for that purpose?

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for the purpose of the Senator from Nebraska suggesting the absence of a quorum, without losing the right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, as I stated before the quorum call was started, I have a brief statement to make with reference to the conference report, to refresh the minds of Senators as to some of the provisions of the measure.

On May 16, the Senate amended and passed S. 872. The House of Representatives subsequently amended and passed the bill and asked for a conference. The conferees met three times to resolve the differences between the two Houses.

In reporting to my colleagues, I am glad to tell them that the differences

between the two versions were not very great and they were resolved without difficulty by the conferees.

LOAN OR GRANT

On the basic question of whether our help to India should be in the form of a loan or a grant, the two Houses were in agreement. Both versions of the bill provided for a loan.

It will be recalled that the original bill presented to the Senate and reported by the Foreign Relations Committee provided for half loan and half grant, but we amended it in this body to make it all a loan.

As Senators will recall, S. 872 authorized the Administrator of the ECA to negotiate the loan of \$190,000,000 to the Government of India for the purchase of food grains, or their equivalents, in the United States. The only difference between the House and Senate in this respect concerned the source of the funds to be loaned. The House version provided funds by means of a public-debt transaction, whereas the Senate bill provided that at least \$100,000,000 of the amount should come from funds heretofore appropriated to the ECA, the balance as necessary coming from a public debt transaction. The House conferees accepted the Senate language embodied in section 3 of the report before us.

REPAYMENT IN STRATEGIC MATERIALS

The language of the House and Senate bills differed with respect to providing for partial repayment of the funds loaned by the shipment of strategic materials to the United States. The Senate version referred to "the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite and manganese" required by the United States. The House language did not refer to these materials by name, but instead called for the transfer of materials "required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources." The House language directed the Administrator of the ECA to "so far as practicable and possible, obtain for the United States the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of such materials particularly those found to be strategic and critical."

While the language of the two bills differed, the conferees felt that there was no difference as to the basic intent of the provisions. It was our belief that the Administrator of the ECA in negotiating the loan of funds to India should make every reasonable effort to seek repayment of the loan in part in strategic materials needed in the United States. We did not believe that specific mention should be made of monazite, a material whose export is embargoed by the Indian Atomic Energy Act. The mention of manganese in the Senate bill seemed unnecessary because at the present time the United States receives about three-fourths of all the manganese which India exports.

For these reasons the House language on strategic materials was included in section 2 of the report. For my part, however, I should not want the Admin-

istrator of this program to assume that the acceptance of the House language by the Senate conferees in any way lessens his duty to do the best that he can to acquire the strategic materials mentioned in the Senate bill.

MUNDT AMENDMENT

The Senate will recall that during consideration of S. 872, we adopted an amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. That amendment provided that interest received from India on or before 1957 should be deposited in a special account for use in encouraging the exchange of information, technicians, and academic persons between the two countries. It would also have provided funds for the use of American educational and philanthropic institutions operating in India.

No similar language was contained in the House bill, although a similar proposal was submitted but ruled out of order.

The conferees gave most careful attention to the Mundt amendment. The language finally agreed upon is in section 7 of the report before us. It limits the funds to be available to \$5,000,000 instead of the sum of \$23,000,000 which it was estimated would have accrued as interest prior to 1957, and as provided in the bill as passed by the Senate.

Therefore, instead of approximately \$23,000,000 being provided, the sum was cut to \$5,000,000.

That part of the amendment which would have provided funds for American institutions operating in India was also stricken. One or two clarifying amendments of the section were adopted.

In view of the vigorous opposition of the House conferees to the Mundt amendment and the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not have an opportunity to give careful study to the proposal at the time it was considering S. 872, it seems wise to me that we have been able to agree upon language which will provide limited funds for a trial period. It may well be that if this program develops successfully and to the mutual advantage of the United States and India that additional sums could be made available in the future.

There are a number of other minor changes in the bill which passed the Senate, but upon which I do not think it necessary to comment at this time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator has concluded his statement with reference to the so-called Mundt amendment, I should like to ask him a few questions with reference to it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. MUNDT. First of all, I desire to congratulate the Senator from Iowa and his fellow conferees, especially the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has been interested in the amendment for a long time, on the very vigorous and successful battle which they made to retain the major portion of the Mundt amendment in the bill. I realize, in view of the fact the House had not acted on

The yeas and nays were not ordered. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 267) making an additional appropriation for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 267) making an additional appropriation for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise again to urge the adoption of my amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan.

Those of us who support my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan do not ask for increases in the appropriations, but we are fighting against reductions. I wish to point out that in the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee, the appropriations have already been substantially reduced below the budget estimates.

Mr. President, research is the backbone of medical progress. Gains which may seem to be small may result in the saving of many thousands of lives. Important developments in the field of research may change history. The splendid work done by the Public Health Service and by our Health Institutes is recognized the world over.

At the recent conference on health, held at Geneva, which I attended in company with my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], I heard nothing but praise and admiration expressed for the work done by the Public Health Service of our country. The value of research work is now recognized throughout the entire world. I think that if the junior Senator from California were on the floor of the Senate at this time, he would bear me out when I state that even the poorest countries are bending every effort to im-

prove their health and sanitary conditions.

Mr. President, when I was governor of my State, during the depression years commencing in 1932, I was able through economy and careful administration to convert a deficit into a large surplus which happily I was able to leave to my successor. At that time I was called a penny pincher, and I suppose I was. I had to be a penny pincher in order to balance the State budget during those extremely difficult years. However, Mr. President, let me say that with all my preoccupation with the subject of economy, there were two activities on which I refused to economize: first, the health of our people; and, second, the education of our people. Health and education are fundamental in any democracy.

Let me point out—and I say this with the fullest degree of conviction—that any country which disregards its obligation to protect the health of its people and to educate its people adequately, inevitably will retrogress. I shall continue to fight for adequate health protection and education so long as I live.

Of course, Mr. President, I favor economy; my entire record in public life proves this to be so. However, the health of our people is a concern of Government which we cannot disregard, and it is a particularly important concern of Government at this time because it is a vital part of our defense effort.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall strongly support the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, because I believe that it will protect the funds which go to the chemists, the biologists, and the researchers who have done so much to protect and improve the health of our nation and the health of the world. Is that not the case?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite true.

Mr. MONRONEY. The appropriation items affected by the amendment do not involve bureaucrats or a vast overhead of bureaucracy or bookkeeping or accounting; but, as I understand the Senator's amendment, it would exempt the appropriations for this very basic medical research from the 10 percent reduction.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; it would exempt the appropriation for research work and for these services from the 10 percent reduction. I am very glad the Senator from Oklahoma has brought up this point, because I wish to present to the Senate some figures which will show what a very small part the expenditures for administration play in these appropriations. It is a very minor part.

Mr. MONRONEY. If a reduction is made, almost all of it will have to be made in the funds for direct medical research, such as the research which developed the typhus vaccine, which today is saving the lives of probably hundreds of thousands of Americans in Korea. Is that not correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. I can say that more than 90 percent of the funds affected by the amendment will be used for the purposes of research in medicine, sanitation, and public health, and those funds will be paid to those who are actually carrying on that work.

Mr. MONRONEY. And they are the ones who have discovered the vaccine for rabbit fever and the vaccines which are used to combat all the plagues, such as malaria, which have reduced the economic status of so many countries. These research workers will develop new drugs to be used to combat those diseases. Is that not correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, and they are of benefit to the entire Nation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I am delighted that the Senator from New York has offered his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. Nevertheless, long before the Senator from Michigan submitted his amendment, the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and the full Appropriations Committee tried to do exactly what the Senator from New York is now trying to do.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal of discussion on the floor of the Senate about the excess number of chauffeurs and bureaucrats and administrators. I am very glad indeed that the Senator from Oklahoma asked the questions he did ask, because they give me an opportunity to present these matters more fully. It has been made to appear that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, if adopted, would serve to eliminate the excess number of chauffeurs and bureaucrats and administrators, as alleged, without in any way affecting the actual services for the protection of the health and welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate what the Senator from New York is trying to do, and I think it should be done. I simply object to having the amendment of the Senator from Michigan considered in any way at all. However, if it must be adopted, I would prefer to have it adopted as it would be modified by the adoption of the amendment which the Senator from New York has offered to it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that I have no doubt that other Senators will speak on other phases of Government activities which may be affected by adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, but I am confining my remarks at this time to the services which are administered by the Public Health Service and by the various Institutes of Health and allied services.

I wish to read certain figures, Mr. President, to refute the claims which have been made here about the great

number of administrators who are used in this work, and the relatively small number of people who are used for the actual conduct of the health activities. In the control of venereal diseases, a total of 720 people are employed. The administrative forces comprise but 36.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator realize that his amendment does not even exempt those engaged in combating venereal diseases?

Mr. LEHMAN. My amendment was supposed to cover—

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator would look at the budget, he would find that control of venereal disease is not under any of the items mentioned in his amendment. Venereal diseases are not mentioned among those which the Senator seeks to exempt.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not quite get the point made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The point is that the Senator's amendment does not cover any question regarding the personnel engaged in health services with respect to venereal diseases.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well, but I want to read these figures. I desire to show how small a number of people is used in the administration of these health activities. Possibly I shall amend my amendment to include the item mentioned by the Senator from Michigan.

I desire to read the list, if I may: Control of tuberculosis, total number employed, 535, used in administration, 60. In assistance to States, general, total number employed, 483, number used for administration, 31; in the control of communicable diseases, total employed, 1,302, used in administration, 137; in engineering sanitation and industrial hygiene, which covers water-pollution control, radiological health, food, milk, and other sanitation activities, sanitation of interstate land, water and air carriers, industrial hygiene, total employed, 649, employed in administration, 37; diseases and sanitary investigation and control, in Alaska, total employed, 75, employed in administration, 9; in grants for hospital construction, total employed, 195, employed in administration, 22.

In hospitals and medical care—and I am reading these figures even though I believe the Senator from Michigan has already said that the employees engaged in this work are not covered by his amendment—

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Nonetheless, I wish to read the figures, in order to show the small percentage of persons used in administration as compared to the great number, even though it may still be inadequate, employed in health activities. The total number employed is 7,627, and of that number only 124 are used in administration.

In foreign quarantine service, total employed, 603; used in administrative services, 33. In direct operations and research, National Institutes of Health,

total employed, 1,567; employed in the administrative branch, 168.

In the National Cancer Institute there is a total of 678 employed, with only 22 used in administration. The others are in field positions, employed in basic and clinical research in cancer, as biochemists, biologists, biophysicists, chemists, cytologists, geneticists, and medical officers. These persons render technical assistance to the States in matters directly connected with research and investigation.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator again state the number of administrative personnel in the National Cancer Institute.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am sorry, I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator again state his understanding of the number of administrative personnel in the National Cancer Institute? That was the last one the Senator mentioned, was it not?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. I have the figures, which have been given to me, showing a total of 678, of which number 22 are in administration.

Mr. CORDON. I am reading from the Budget appendix, and I call the Senator's attention to the figures listed. In grade 7, which is an administrative grade, with salaries running from \$3,800 to \$4,500, there are 47; in grade 6, with a salary height of \$4,200, there are 13; in grade 5, top salary \$3,850, there are 120; grade 4, top salary \$3,355, there are 67; in grade 3, top salary \$3,130, there are 81; in grade 2, top salary \$2,930, there are 38; and in grade 1, the lowest, top salary \$2,680, there are 19. Of necessity, those must all be administrative personnel.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I am quoting from the volume of justification issued by the Budget Bureau, on page 72A, which shows that there are 22 positions listed under the heading of administration.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator permit me to say that this is the President's budget? The figures I quoted are from the official document.

Mr. LEHMAN. This also is an official document, I may say.

Mr. CORDON. Then I hope the President will get together with himself and give us some figures upon which both of us may rely.

Mr. LEHMAN. If I may inquire, how many positions has the Senator from Oregon enumerated?

Mr. CORDON. I shall determine the number, and let the Senator know in a moment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield gladly to my colleague.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask my colleague whether he has any knowledge of the amount of money involved in the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I think I can give the Senator the figure.

Mr. IVES. It has not been brought out, as yet, to my knowledge; at least, I

have not heard it, and I think it is important.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am including all the services, with the exception of hospitals and medical care. I am including all the services, even though the Senator from Michigan has drawn my attention to the fact, or has made the statement, that some of these services are not covered by my amendment. But, including all of those—because I think they all should be covered by my amendment—the saving would be \$1,807,000; that is all.

Mr. IVES. That is, the saving on all the services?

Mr. LEHMAN. On all the services, with the exception of hospitals and medical care.

Mr. IVES. My understanding was that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan would save only around \$2,000,000, itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. About \$11,000,000.

Mr. IVES. How do the figures of the Senator from Michigan check with the figures of my colleague, the Senator from New York, in the matter of the amounts involved in his amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. The difficulty with the amendment of the Senator from New York is that he includes a number of things which are not included in the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from New York includes hospital and medical care. The Senator from Michigan does not at all cover hospital and medical care; and that may be a big item.

Mr. LEHMAN. No, if the Senator will pardon me, I have not included hospitals and medical care.

Mr. FERGUSON. I submit that the Senator has included them on line 4 of his amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true as to my amendment, but the Senator from Michigan has said that under his amendment they would not be affected.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I still do not understand exactly how much, under the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, is to be affected by my colleague's amendment. Was it \$1,600,000, with all the services included?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. But, with the services immediately involved in the amendment, does the Senator have any idea what the amount would be? That is important.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like first to answer the question propounded by my colleague. In my amendment it would be less than \$1,000,000.

Mr. IVES. Considerably less than 10 percent of the total saving involved by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very considerably less. But I may say to my colleague that I believe all these services should be included in an amendment similar to mine.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, the full effect of it would be to exempt the various health items which would be affected by the Ferguson amendment. As to these items, the Ferguson amendment proposes to make a saving of \$230,027 in the item affecting the National Institute of Health. In the National Cancer Institute item, I believe the Ferguson amendment would provide a saving of \$141,829. In the item relating to the mental health activities, I believe the Ferguson amendment would make a saving of \$62,026. In the National Heart Institute item there would be a reduction or a saving of \$77,018. As to dental health, there would be a cut of \$52,692. I believe I am correct in these figures.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator is substantially correct.

Mr. IVES. What is the total?

Mr. THYE. I have not totaled the figures. I have given the individual items.

As a member of the subcommittee, I sat through the hearings and listened to all the testimony. We listened to representatives of national associations and to testimony sent in by governors of States. The Governor of the State of Minnesota sent a statement on the mental health item. It is the desire of every one of us to economize, we have heard much talk about meat-tax action and pruning by the use of surgical instruments, and I should like to apply those means, but I am a little fearful that we might cut into the very heart muscle of someone who had been trained for years in research and who might find some way of saving the life of a person afflicted with a heart ailment or with cancer.

I am personally familiar with thousands of cases in mental institutions, because, as Governor of Minnesota for 4 years, I had the responsibility for those institutions. I know that there are men and women aimlessly wandering about, or in a condition requiring strait-jackets, because, if they were not so confined, they would tear their own flesh or that of other inmates. In view of all that, knowing the progress which has been made in research in mental health, knowing the splendid work of research in heart diseases and in cancer, for the life of me I personally cannot see any economy in reducing appropriations for health measures, such as that for the Cancer Institute, by \$141,829; mental health, by \$62,026; National Heart Institute, by \$77,018; and dental health, by \$52,692.

I should like to apply economy wherever it is possible; I would help to swing even a broadaxe, if necessary, but when it is sought to cut down on fundamental items involving the cure of mental cases confined to institutions, when we know that through research a great deal has been accomplished in that field during recent years, and when we know of the great research which is carried on by those engaged in caring for mental cases which arose in World War II, and how they have helped immeasurably in research development, I feel that I am perfectly justified in supporting the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York, because I think it means economy rather than expenditure.

So, Mr. President, I say to my colleagues that while I think the Ferguson amendment, in general, is most commendable, and I shall support it in reference to all items except those relating to health research and health benefits, I shall, as to those items, support the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very helpful remarks. I wish to point out that it is not a question of possibly discharging persons who might do good work. There is a certainty that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan should prevail with reference to the health services of the National Cancer Institute, between 35 and 40 persons would have to be discharged. If only a very slight gain were made this year or next year in cancer research, or in the studying of heart diseases or mental diseases, probably many thousands of lives would be saved, and certainly the very small expense that is entailed would be merited and justified a hundred times over.

I yield to the Senator from Arizona, if he desires to ask a question.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico was endeavoring to ask me a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Much as I like what the Senator from New York has said, I do not want him to think that all of a sudden he is trying to save the situation, because the committee tried to save it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In a minute.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think I have the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New York has no more interest in the bill than has the Senator from New Mexico. I attended all the hearings. I did not come here at the last minute to say something for public health. I worked and suffered the agony of the damned.

The Senator may proceed, and I shall speak in my own time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. If I may first answer the Senator from New Mexico, I shall be glad to yield.

I think I have said 50 times on the floor of the Senate that I have the deepest appreciation of the humanitarian instincts and the splendid work of the Senator from New Mexico. I know how hard he has worked on this bill. I also know how sincerely I have supported him thus far. I claim no credit for greater interest in this work than that of any other Senator. I know we are all interested in saving lives. I do not know what the Senator from New Mexico means by this attack on me. We are working on the same side of the street. We are trying to help people. I thought I was supporting the Senator from New Mexico. When I believe the Senator from New Mexico to be right I shall support him, and I hope he will support me.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico for

his fight for the bill. I also wish to commend the Senator from New York. Trouble always ensues from proposals to make percentage-wise cuts. In making them we do not know what we are doing. It is being very well demonstrated on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that when percentage-wise cuts are proposed to be made, in many cases items which should be cut are not cut and those which should not be cut are cut.

What the Senator from New York is trying to do is to save the health of the country. The main reasons for making cuts is that we need money for the defense of the country, and that effort entails a vast cost.

Mr. President, if there are items in the bill which involve the health of the people which the Senator from New York has not included in his amendment, I hope he will include them. I can think of nothing that will help the defense of the United States in greater measure than the protection of the health of our people, making them healthy and strong. I hope the Senate will never come to the point where it will vote against proper appropriations which involve the health and the welfare of the people of the country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. Pardon me a moment. Only a small amount of money is involved. We really do not know what we are doing when we make percentage-wise cuts that affect items involving health.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am the chairman of the subcommittee. We would not have had any trouble whatsoever with the Lehman amendment or any other amendments, so far as the question of taking care of public health is concerned, if it had not been for the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. That amendment was offered. Then the Senator from New York offered an amendment to the Ferguson amendment, in an endeavor to try to protect the situation. But up to that particular time, the subject of public health was being cared for by the committee?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I grant that what the Senator from New Mexico says is true. But inasmuch as the Ferguson amendment has been offered, and since it affects the health and welfare of the people of the country, let us do the best we can.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. That is why I say I am against it. That is why I want to vote it down. However, I do not believe it is fair to say that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is now being saved by the amendment of the Senator from New York. The committee itself first endeavored to save the

situation. We do not want the Ferguson amendment or any other amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from New Mexico misunderstood me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly so. But I also know the English language.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think anyone is accusing the Senator from New Mexico of not having the interest of the health of the people of the country at heart. I know he worked hard in his committee on this measure. Had it not been for the offering of crippling amendments, particularly the one by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the amendment of the Senator from New York would not have been necessary. We all concede that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only thing we can do now is to defeat the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am very much astonished that nearly every speech in the Senate on the pending bill has started with the rather naive prelude, "I am for economy," and then come all the exceptions. We can take the remarks made by the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from New York, and apply them to nearly every research item in the Agricultural appropriation bill, the Interior Department appropriation bill, to every one of the 12 supply bills as they come along. We can fill those bills with emotionalism, and then what happens to economy?

We can come to but one conclusion. There is a real doubt in my mind, and a real doubt in the minds of the people of the country, whether the Senate wants any economy as a matter of fact. I doubt very much that Members of the Senate do.

Mr. President, I am thoroughly disappointed. Instead of glorifying the subcommittee, I want to say that I am thoroughly disappointed in the action of the subcommittee in not following up on public assistance. That subject is passed off with one paragraph. The report says there is dissatisfaction with relief administration, and the subject is left there.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue. Yet there is a delegation from Indiana now in the Social Security Agency trying to cope with this matter, trying to secure a requirement that the names of the recipients be made public, or be made open to public inspection. There is nothing to that effect in the report, nothing in the hearings, nothing in the amendments to the Social Security Act that have lifted these assistance payment from \$400,000,000 in 1946 to \$1,300,000,000 in 1952.

I am not going to glorify the subcommittee when they have failed in that respect. That is where the subcommittee could have done good work.

So I do not want to hear anything about so-called economy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly not. When the Senator does not want to listen, he does not have to remain and listen.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois remain in the Chamber a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; I want him to remain also.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yielded to the Senator from Illinois for a question, not to make a campaign speech.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not going to make a campaign speech. But the Senator from Illinois raised the question of who sincerely believe in economy. I want to repeat what I said, and I am going to say it again later in my remarks, that I am for economy heart and soul, but I do not believe it to be economy to risk the lives and the health of the people of the country when a small amount of money will further our efforts to protect them. That is not economy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is an entirely backward step in the social life and the thinking of this enlightened Nation. That is not economy, no matter what the Senator from Illinois may say.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is true that the Senator from Illinois used to be a Member of the House. It is also correct that the Senator from New Mexico used to be a Member of the House. But when the Senator from Illinois says there is no reason for glorifying the subcommittee, I call his attention to the fact that the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee is the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]; that another member of the subcommittee is the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]; that another member of the subcommittee is the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], as is also the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. That subcommittee cut the appropriations contained in the House bill \$112,000,000, which is unusual, because generally the Senate committee restores cuts made by the House, or increases the amount provided by the House. Since in this instance we cut \$112,000,000 from the House items, I cannot go along with my good friend from Illinois and agree with him that we did not do our duty. We may have been mistaken as to certain conclusions we reached.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for an observation at that point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I could hardly put it in the form of a question and respond to the observation made by the Senator from New Mexico, but I will be very brief and endeavor to put it in the form of a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not through.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that the remarks of the Senator from Illinois in connection with saving money will be printed in the home newspapers in Illinois, in the Decatur, Ill., newspaper, and in other newspapers. But the Senator from New Mexico, as chairman of the subcommittee, certainly tried to save money. The subcommittee tried to save money. I think perhaps our only mistake is that we did. If we had approved all the Budget items just as they were, instead of trying to act in good faith with the Senate, we possibly would have thought differently. But the report of the subcommittee was unanimous. The ranking Republican member of that subcommittee, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is not a wastrel. Neither is the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The report of the full committee was unanimous. After we have saved \$112,000,000, it is not fair to be accused of not doing our duty.

As I have previously stated, the three men to whom I have referred do not need to be on the payroll. We can save money in our offices. We do not have to have Mr. Johnson on the payroll. We can save money. But is that the way the Government should function? Or should necessary expenditures be met? I am not referring to waste. I am not referring to unnecessary payrolls. But we should carry on the functions of government. Should not the Senate carry on, even if we must employ office stenographers?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my good friend that seven times in seven fiscal years we have made reductions in the appropriations for old-age assistance, and seven times in seven years the agency in charge of the administration of that activity has come back for a deficiency appropriation. That has happened every year since 1944. The cut which is proposed here is not an economy unless we can come to the end of the fiscal year and find that the cut has been made to stick.

I know what the hearings show. I have been boning up at night on the hearings. I understand that there are demands for new benefits, for permanent disability benefits, and for other things. Those demands will probably result in a deficiency appropriation, so where is the economy?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator deny that we cut \$150,000,000 from the old-age assistance item?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the reduction stick?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will help us make it stick this time, it will be easier to make it stick next year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It never has stuck before.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Whether it sticks or not, the committee did save \$150,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What the Senator means is that the committee temporarily cut it out. The agency will be back in

the fall saying, "Here is a new estimate of our obligations."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly so. I do not know what the committee will do eventually. I do not know what the next Congress will do. However, as far as this committee is concerned, there is \$150,000,000 less for old-age assistance. What else can we do?

Next year there will be another session of Congress. I cannot tie the hands of that session of Congress. However, so far as this committee is concerned, I assure the Senator from Illinois that there is \$150,000,000 less for old-age assistance. What will be done next year I do not know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When we come to the end of the fiscal year, the question is, in terms of the budget, How much money have we saved? Unless we can go along with the Ferguson amendment and accomplish something in the way of a saving which will stick until June 30, 1952, there will be no real economy.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have listened to the very eloquent remarks of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], during the course of which he mentioned by name. The remarks were to the effect that we were all talking about economy and that that was about as far as we would go.

The Senator from Illinois was possibly not present in the Chamber when I stated that I would support the Ferguson amendment with respect to all the items except the five items relating to research. Those items are as follows:

First, the National Institutes of Health.

Second, the National Cancer Institute.

Third, the mental-health activities.

Fourth, the National Heart Institute.

Fifth, dental-health activities.

Mr. President, I was present during the committee hearings, and I listened to the testimony which was given by representatives of the various national organizations which are engaged in health research. If we were to make a reduction in the funds for such activities, I do not believe that it would be an economy. I think it would be a short-sighted attempt at economy.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that I will support the Ferguson amendment in all its reductions throughout the entire bill, with the exception of the five research activities to which I have referred. The only reason I do not support the Ferguson amendment in that respect is that I do not believe it would be an economy.

I am very happy to say to the junior Senator from Illinois that I am just as economy-minded as he is. However, after having sat through all the hearings, I fail to see the economy in making a reduction with respect to these five items. Therefore, I shall support the amendment which proposes to exempt those items from the so-called Ferguson amendment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I merely wish to comment on the very pertinent remark of our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I hope he will not leave the Chamber.

I yield to no other Member of this body in my efforts to achieve economy and in my record of supporting and voting for measures calling for economy. The other day I had occasion to figure out the total amount of authorizations against which I had voted in the past fiscal year. I discovered that they amounted to more than \$10,000,000,000. I yield to no one on the question of economy. If my distinguished colleague from Illinois will watch my voting in this session of Congress, he will find that in nearly every instance I shall be voting for the economy motion, and for all the amendments which are aimed at economy.

The point I wish to raise is this: I have added up the figures presented this afternoon by our distinguished colleague from Minnesota. They come to approximately \$573,000 in savings under the Ferguson amendment as it applies to the particular items which are covered by the Lehman amendment modifying the Ferguson amendment. If the figures given me by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are correct, when he states that approximately \$11,700,000,000 in savings are involved in his amendment, only 5 percent of such total saving is involved in the Lehman amendment.

Mr. President, for years some of us have been struggling to get an appropriation adequate to take care of the particular items which are covered by the amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Year after year an effort has been made to get enough. I am satisfied from what I know that we have not enough yet, the economy situation being what it is. We are faced with conditions over which we have no control.

The position taken by the committee in this respect, when it comes to these particular items, is probably sound. I would not endeavor to upset what the committee has done by trying to increase the appropriations for these items. However, I disagree most heartily with the proposal made by my distinguished colleague from Michigan. I think it is altogether out of order so far as these particular activities are concerned. I hope that in the name of economy, as well as in the name of humanity, the amendment offered by my colleague from New York will be sustained by the Senate. If the Senator from Michigan were present, I would ask him if he would be willing to accept that amendment. It would in no way destroy what he is trying to do. Ninety-five percent of the saving which he is endeavoring to make, assuming that his amendment were adopted, would still be realized if the Lehman amendment were also adopted. I urge the Senate to vote for the amendment of my colleague.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have listened to a rather lengthy discourse on the pending appropriation bill, particularly the section which deals with the health of our people and the welfare of our children and their mothers. It seems to me that we are attempting to place a cash value on children and mothers. I should like to know from some of our dollar-and-cent experts, of whom we seem to have several on the floor, what they believe to be the cash value of a 5-year-old child. Does a 5-year-old child have any cash value? What, if anything, is it worth to restore a crippled person, who is a care upon his family or a burden on his community, to a position where he may become self-supporting and self-respecting once more? What is the cash value of a healthy mother, as compared with a sickly mother? Are we to determine all these questions in terms of dollars and cents, and decide that the fewer the cents the better off the country will be?

Mr. President, a ship is being built down at Newport News. It will soon be launched. It is an \$80,000,000 ocean liner, which will be used in the North Atlantic service. It will be turned over to one of our shipping lines for \$28,000,000. In other words, we are making them a present of \$50,000,000. That amount of money is 50 percent more than we plan to appropriate for maternal and child welfare work in this country. We are spending billions of dollars in helping corporations expand their industrial plants, at the expense of our taxpayers. We hear little objection here on the floor to such expenditures. Are the lives of our children and the health of our mothers worth anything at all? To hear the talk this afternoon one might assume that probably we ought to drown them all and get them out of the way. Then they would not cost us anything at all. Are we to deal with the problem in that way? No; I will not vote for the Ferguson amendment. I will not vote for the Lehman amendment either. "I will not vote for the Lehman amendment because it omits maternal, child, and rehabilitation services, which are just as important to the people affected as are similar services to those who are affected by heart trouble and other diseases. I am not in favor of scrimping or saving money at the expense of the lives of our children. I think our children are worth much more than all the millions of Detroit or Chicago put together."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I am opposed to anything of the nature of the Ferguson amendment. The Senate has shown that it has the ability to deal with items one by one. We adopted an amendment the other day which was offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. It provided for a cut in appropriations for the solicitor's office of the Department of Labor. I voted in favor of the Senator's amendment. The Senator has many more amendments to offer. I shall vote for some of them. We have shown our ability to deal with items one by one. We should not resort to a dangerous

across-the-board cut. We have shown our ability. We should now have the courage and determination to deal with the problem in the proper way. We should not put a dollars-and-cents value on the life of a child, an expectant mother, or a sick person. For heaven's sake, let us get away from that attitude in attacking the problems which we have before us.

Mr. President, I do not see how a Senator can stand on the floor and talk about saving a hundred dollars or a thousand dollars at the expense of someone's life. In other words, we are being asked to let the cripple stay crippled. Last year it cost approximately \$490 to put about 50,000 of them in a position where they could help themselves, instead of remaining helpless. I do not know what we can have in mind when we talk about saving a few dollars at the expense of lives and letting children be born of mothers who are physically not in a condition to take care of them. What are we thinking of?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that he knows me well enough to be quite certain that I agree with everything he has said today. He has expressed my sentiments probably far better than I could express them.

Mr. AIKEN. We are not trying to increase the personnel or the appropriation for maternal or child welfare and vocational rehabilitation. Why should we undertake to cut back beyond what we have done in past years. We are not asking for an increase.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Vermont has stated that he would not vote for my amendment. The reason he gave was that the amendment did not include grants for maternal and child welfare services. I may point out that my amendment refers only to the Public Health Service. As he knows, grants for maternal care and child welfare come under other categories.

Mr. AIKEN. But a cut is involved there.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Ferguson amendment would make a cut.

Mr. AIKEN. There is already a 5-percent cut in the personnel appropriation, and under the Ferguson amendment there would be an additional cut of 5 percent. Therefore the appropriation would be cut back to a point where it would be 10 percent less than was appropriated during previous years.

Mr. LEHMAN. I agree entirely with the Senator from Vermont that the cut proposed in the Ferguson amendment would apply to other items in which I and the Senator from Vermont are interested.

Mr. AIKEN. It would cut everything.

Mr. LEHMAN. However, Mr. President, I do not think it is a good reason for the Senator's not voting for my amendment, because my amendment, after all, is an amendment to the Ferguson amendment. He could still vote against the Ferguson amendment. I hope he will vote against it. In the event that the Ferguson amendment is not defeated and my amendment is adopted, we will be at least that much better off.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from New York that I am voting against his amendment because it does not include provisions in relation to maternal care, child welfare, and vocational rehabilitation. If the Senator's amendment should carry with my vote, he then could vote for the Ferguson amendment. If his amendment were rejected, I believe he would vote against the Ferguson amendment. We should take the items one by one. We should have the courage to do it. We should vote for them one by one.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator from Vermont what he would suggest with reference to my amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I would include vocational rehabilitation and maternal and child welfare services so far as personnel was concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. I hesitated to do it, because I thought my amendment was clean cut and showed the ridiculous character of the move for false economy. I did not want to complicate the situation. I think I was wise in not doing so, because I can still vote against items as they are brought up.

Mr. AIKEN. That would not be done. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether the suffering of a 5-year-old homeless child is not of as much concern to us as a person who has a bad heart.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not a cripple, who is a burden upon his community, but who wants to become self-supporting once more, as much our concern as any other person who is suffering from a disease? I think they all ought to be included.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. From the bottom of my heart I thank the Senator from Vermont for his remarks. I know he belongs to the other side of the aisle, but he is true blue. He is an American. He represents what I understand to be the concept of our ideals, and a concept of what is American. I pay tribute to the Senator from Vermont.

I think we owe more of a sacred duty to the mentally ill. How can they protect themselves? The Senator testified before the committee that more than 800,000 of them are in mental institutions. We are not talking about those whose families can care for them, but we are speaking only of those who are in public institutions. Do we owe them a duty? Should we give them some consideration? Of course, we know that those who have heart disease can speak for themselves and can make their own complaints to Senators. However, that is not true of the poor unfortunates who suffer from mental illness. So I am glad that there are Members of the Senate and there are people elsewhere in the United States who do pay attention to these matters.

After all, Mr. President, a person who is suffering from tuberculosis can complain about his situation, and so can a person who is suffering from heart disease or a person who is suffering from

cancer; but what about those who are suffering from mental illness? We owe them a duty, for that reason.

So I am very glad that the Senator from Vermont spoke as he did, and I am very glad that the Senator from New York has submitted his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

So far as health is concerned, I hope we realize that, in contrast, millions and billions of dollars are appropriated and spent for destruction, to kill people. I hope that we who serve in this body will not be so niggardly that we do not pay a little attention to the health of our people.

The Congress votes millions and millions of dollars in appropriations to be used to eradicate diseases of horses and cows and poultry, but then it is proposed that a 10-percent reduction be made in the appropriation items for the health of our people and in the appropriations to be used to find cures for heart disease, cancer, and other serious diseases, some of which may kill some of the present Members of the Senate, and certainly they will kill many other persons.

I really am disgusted that the Senate would seriously entertain a proposal to reduce these appropriations. After all, our Government spends more money in taking care of cows than it does in taking care of babies. I think the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York are correct on this point.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question. I decline to yield for speeches until my remarks are concluded.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well, I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to commend the humanitarianism of the Senator from New York, but I should also like to ask him a question. Is it true, as he said, that we are spending millions of dollars to help millionaires expand their war plants, or are we giving them certificates of necessity to spend their own money?

Mr. LEHMAN. That question has nothing to do with the pending question, of course.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So much misinformation has been given out and so much distress has been generated thereby, that I think the Senator from New York fell into error in using that point as an argument in favor of his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I do not think I did. However, I should like to reply to what the Senator from Virginia has said.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I hope the Senator from New York will do so.

Mr. LEHMAN. Under the certificates of necessity, grants may be made to companies which allegedly are expanding in order to increase their defense production potential. Under the law, such companies are allowed to charge for the complete depreciation of those plants within 5 years.

It has been demonstrated—and members of the Banking and Currency Committee have made this statement at meetings of the committee and also on the floor of the Senate—that \$2,500,000,000 of certificates of necessity were given to 20 large companies, and that many of those companies are being given an exaggerated allowance for depreciation, which will completely cover the cost of those plants within 5 or 6 years, whereas the life of the plants may be 40 or 50 or 60 years—thus gaining a great deal through the generosity of the Government.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is misinformation before us, as well as elsewhere, Mr. President. The average of the certificates of necessity is about 60 percent; and on the basis of 60 percent, a manufacturer who expands his plant on the basis of present defense spending is going to lose money if peace comes next year and thus ends the defense activities. Such a manufacturer is gambling that we are going to spend \$40,000,000,000 or \$50,000,000,000 a year for 5 years. He puts his own money into that gamble, and we obtain the production we need now, through the expenditure of his money, instead of by embarking on a socialized plan of government and then wiping out the entire investment after the war is over.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia knows very well that a war plant which is erected either with or without the help of the Government has a normal life of 40, 50, or 60 years or more; and a manufacturer who can depreciate such a plant in full in 5 or 6 years will certainly profit through the generosity of the Government.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator from New York recall that in 1933, when the total capacity of our steel companies was approximately 70,000,000 tons, they were operating at 50 percent of capacity? Now they are producing at the rate of 110,000,000 tons a year. Does the Senator think anyone can be certain that 110,000,000 tons of steel can be sold each year for the next 5 years or 50 years, as the Senator has indicated? Certainly they are taking a gamble.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I think they can.

Mr. President, I wish to resume my remarks. I have already referred to the number of persons who are employed at various health and research institutes and the number of them who are engaged in administrative work. I wish to continue my statement along those lines.

In mental health activities, a total of 250 persons are employed, with an administrative staff of 36.

The National Heart Institute has a total staff of 367 employees, and only 12 of them are administrative employees.

The dental health activities have a total of 222 employees, and only 7 of them are on the administrative staff.

Mr. President, when it comes to the question of saving money by reducing appropriations for public works which are demonstrated to be nonessential, I will go as far as will any other Member of the Senate. However, Mr. President,

in my opinion public health and research are essential activities in furthering the safety and welfare of our people and of our Nation. If we are not convinced that by means of research and public health services we can save lives, and can advance the health of our people, we should not make any appropriations for those purposes. However, we are convinced that appropriations for those purposes will result in the saving of lives and in improving the health of our people, because history has demonstrated the value of these activities.

In New York State we have splendid research facilities. We have there one of the best research laboratories in the United States. New York has long been very active in the fight against pneumonia, particularly through the development of serums. Our State has made large appropriations in that connection. I am sorry that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] is not now on the floor, for I wish to state that I am very grateful to him for the help he gave to me when I was Governor of New York and when he was the leader of the majority in the New York State Assembly. He gave me a very great deal of assistance in securing the necessary appropriations for carrying on this work.

The research work done in New York and the various areas which are developed, manufactured, and provided to the doctors and hospitals in New York are of tremendous service to the people of New York, and constitute a great protection to their health and safety. But, Mr. President, let me say that I am quite as much interested in saving the lives of those in the poorest of our States as I am in saving the lives of the people in my own State of New York; and we know that many of the States have inadequate facilities, and, in some cases, no facilities whatever, for research.

The Senator from Vermont asked what was the price of a child's life. It was a moving and pertinent and timely question. Let me say that if we saw a chance to save thousands or even hundreds of the lives of our fighting men or our other citizens or protect them against the hazards of accident, catastrophe, or illness, we should consider that no expenditure within our means was too large. But it is now proposed that we cut down on medical and public-health expenditures, fields in which we have demonstrated that what we are doing is of direct benefit, not only to thousands, but to literally millions of our people. The saving at best is relatively small, less than \$1,000,000 for the various services which are covered by my amendment and less than \$2,000,000 if we were to include all the services connected with public-health activities. That saving is relatively small compared with our total expenditures. The suffering and loss of life because of that cut may be large beyond calculation.

I feel so strongly about this question that it is hard to translate my feelings into words. It is claimed that the United States is an enlightened country, and I know that it is. I am glad to say we have done more in this country to

raise the standards of medicine, public health, and sanitation than has been done in any other country in the world; and in doing that, we have helped the whole world. We have not been selfish. We have not reserved our advances, our discoveries, or the development of our sciences merely for the use of our own people. We have been glad to share them with other people. But we have a very long way to go. We have found neither the cause nor the cure of many of the most deadly diseases known to mankind. We have conquered smallpox, yellow fever, typhoid fever, the plague, and typhus, but we have not conquered heart disease, mental disease, cancer, poliomyelitis, or the many other deadly diseases with which human beings are beset.

I said Friday on the floor of the Senate that 1 out of every 20 people in this country either has suffered, is suffering, or will suffer from some phase of mental disease. I think the sufferers from mental disease are among the most unfortunate in the world, quite as unfortunate as those who die more quickly from cancer or heart disease, because, as has been said, they cannot help themselves, they need the help of others.

We are making progress in research and in the treatment of mental disease. New York State today is spending more than \$150,000,000 in the care and cure of the insane, in State institutions and probably two or three times that sum is spent in private institutions and by families.

We are making progress, though slowly, it is true, in the study of heart disease, of cancer, and of other diseases with which we are coping. Let us not call a halt to it. Let us not retreat. Let us not tell the world that the study of the diseases of chickens and cattle and pigs is more important to this country than the study, under proper research conditions, of the deadly disease which beset mankind. We are going to get at the secret of their prevention if possible, and, in those cases where prevention is impossible, the secret of cure or at least of amelioration. We are not going to do this by chance. Teamwork on the part of hospitals, private institutions, our colleges and universities and laboratories, working in cooperation with the Federal Government and with State governments, will be required. If we maintain that teamwork, and if Government does its utmost, not sparingly, not grudgingly, but with deep conviction that we shall be able to make progress, we will win the battle.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, today I find myself in opposition to both the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the Ferguson amendment. With other members of the Appropriations Committee, I had the opportunity to go rather carefully into the several items which make up the bill which is now before the Senate. The committee had in mind, both when examining the justifications for the several items in subcommittee, and in the markup by the subcommittee, as well as in the final ac-

tion of the whole committee, the necessities with respect to dollars which face the Nation. The committee made certain severe reductions in many of the items of the bill. When I say severe, I mean severe, so far as the committee within its limited time, could determine the facts.

I desire to be perfectly frank in discussing the pending bill. I have said before, and I now reiterate, that it is humanly impossible for the several subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee to make the careful, comprehensive investigation into the executive departments of the Government which alone would permit the committee to do a fully advised job on appropriations. The staff of the committee are devoted and competent in their work, though insufficient numerically, and if the committee, with its staff, cannot probe deeply and comprehensively enough into the several justifications fully to understand how much money is absolutely essential to carry on the activities of Government, and what requests may be properly denied, how much less able are the Members of the Senate, with all deference to them and to their ability to do that work? That does not mean, Mr. President, that the Senate should not at the appropriate time act, if it desires to act. I believe, however, that it does mean that the action of the subcommittee, followed by that of the full Committee on Appropriations, should at least carry some weight on the floor of the Senate when appropriation bills are presented. Otherwise, perhaps we had better get rid of the committee and legislate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, the committee, in examining the bill in full session, felt that there had been one particular in which Congress had failed to do its full duty in reporting appropriation bills in the past. That was in attempting to indicate in reports what portion of appropriated funds should be used for the employment of personnel and what should be used for other purposes. Such a report can never be more than advisory. There is no legal obligation upon the departments to follow it. Substantially all items of appropriation carrying funds for personal services have combined in the items not only payments for personnel but also the amounts necessary to meet estimated expenses of the particular agency or division of the agency in question. Such an item usually appears under the heading "Salaries and expenses." In many other items the two factors of salaries and expenses are combined with various other proposed expenditures, sometimes including construction, sometimes funds for the farming out of efforts to other agencies, sometimes funds for grants.

It is most difficult to understand the final disposition to be made of appropriated funds. Understanding cannot be had in that field without a most careful study, first, of the President's budget itself, a volume of more than 1,000 pages of statistical data, and then, Mr. President, there are presented before the committee for each agency for which an appropriation is asked, and for each activity within that agency, tables of

justification of the several amounts requested. Broken down, we may find, at last, personnel; we may find expenditures itemized; we may find reimbursable items, contractual service items, and so on, all in detail.

Representatives of the several agencies appear before the subcommittees, and, after having made their own original presentations, are examined by members of the committee. The hearings are available to the full committee. Special compilations, termed "side slips," are prepared by the staff of the committee. In this instance, the side slips comprise some 220 pages. So the committee does have some idea, at least, of what is before it. It has some basis for its decision. It has before it last year's appropriation for the several items, the appropriation for the year before, and so on.

Reverting now to my first proposition, Mr. President, the necessity for some control over appropriated funds with respect to personal services, the committee this year adopted a motion which the Senator from Oregon happened to present and which was fully discussed by the committee, for statutory control over funds appropriated with respect to the application of such funds to the payment for personal services. In my opinion, the principle adopted is a long step forward in sound appropriative practice. For the first time in the history of appropriations, so far as I am aware, and definitely for the first time since I have been a member of the committee, the committee has recommended a statutory ceiling on the amount of appropriated money which may be used for the purposes of paying for personal services.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The 5-percent provision, as it would relate to personal services, was really a substitute for the Jensen amendment, was it not?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct. It was so treated by the committee.

Mr. THYE. And the committee, after much study, and after having given consideration to the explanation by the General Comptroller's Office relating to the Jensen amendment and the impossibility of making the Jensen amendment administratively workable, gave the Cordon amendment consideration. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. The 5-percent provision, as it relates to personal services, was adopted as a means of controlling and reducing personnel expenditures in the various Federal agencies as a substitute for what was known as the Jensen rider in the House appropriations bill.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct as to one of the two major purposes of the amendment.

I have said, Mr. President, that the amendment serves as a statutory limit upon the expenditure of appropriated funds for personal services. The amendment provided—I say "provided" because at least in one instance it is no longer effective in detail—for a ceiling on all

expenditures of appropriated funds for personal services of 95 percent of the amount estimated for that purpose in the President's budget. That means that in no instance can more than 95 percent of the budgeted item for personal services be expended for that purpose in the fiscal year. Heretofore any portion of any appropriation which included personal services might be used for personal services unless some portion was statutorily earmarked and thus excluded. Generally the money provided for the two items, salaries and expenses, might be used for salaries to the extent that the head of the department in his judgment decided. That, the Congress had failed, in my opinion, to exercise its full authority and responsibility in that particular field.

Mr. President, the amendment appears not as a single amendment in the bill, but throughout the bill wherever there are appropriations which include personal services. It applies to every item in the bill for personal services except the items for hospitals and direct medical care. With respect to those items there is no ceiling fixed by the bill. They were excepted by unanimous vote, I believe, of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I understand correctly that the items in the bill which the amendment of the Senator from New York would eliminate from the Ferguson amendment, were eliminated by the amendment of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CORDON. Not all of them. Foreign quarantine was not eliminated by my amendment; the Heart Institute, the Cancer Institute, and the like, were not eliminated, except as within those categories there were items for hospitals and direct medical aid.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, where they apply to direct personal service in hospitals and in providing direct medical aid. That is the distinguishing difference between what the amendment of the Senator from New York would do to the Ferguson amendment, and the amendment adopted by the committee, which was sponsored by the able Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon if it is not a fact that the Ferguson amendment, so far as its purpose is concerned, and its full force and effect, is identical with the Cordon amendment except that it makes an additional 5-percent reduction in the ceiling?

Mr. CORDON. That is my understanding of the legal effect of the Ferguson amendment. The Ferguson amendment presents this question, and I think only this question: Should the action of the committee in fixing a ceiling of 95 percent of the budget figures for personal services be changed to make the ceiling 90 percent?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I shall yield to the Senator from Vermont in a moment. Under the Ferguson amendment hospitals and direct medical care would be excepted, because they were excepted by the committee. The legal effect of the Ferguson amendment, therefore, is simply to double the 5 percent which was the amount of the reduction under the so-called Cordon amendment, which is the committee amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that the Cordon amendment, the 5-percent amendment, was not exactly an across-the-board cut? Did not the subcommittee increase some appropriations before applying the 5 percent? I have in mind particularly the appropriation for the Children's Bureau, for which I believe the House allowed \$1,450,000 for personal services, and I believe the Senate committee increased that somewhat before applying the 5 percent, evidently on the theory that the amount that was left was the amount needed, which happens to be the amount the Bureau had last year, and, I believe, the year before, and for some time before that. In other words, evidently the committee thought this particular Bureau was entitled to \$1,500,000. So in that respect it was not exactly an across-the-board cut, certainly not an across-the-board cut as the bill came from the House.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Vermont is slightly confused with respect to the legal effect involved.

Mr. AIKEN. I concede that.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to do what I can to clarify the situation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. May I say for the Record that I did not have the bill or any material in my hand when I discussed the matter.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator made himself perfectly clear. I had expected to advert to that particular matter because, I may say to the Senator from Vermont, initially the amendatory provision did not operate as a reduction in an appropriation. It operated as a ceiling on expenditures and as a ceiling on expenditures it does operate on every item in the bill—on every item. In those instances where the action of the Appropriations Committee was a recommendation of the budget request in an amount, the total sum of which was greater than 95 percent of the budget request for personnel, there was a reduction. If the committee had made a reduction greater than the 5 percent of the personnel budget item, then there was no dollar reduction in the bill, but the limitation would still be there.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I find on examining the bill itself that the committee increased the appropriation from \$1,450,000 to \$1,500,000 before applying the amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Irrespective of that amendment, that does not change the Budget figure, and the Senator's amendment relates to the Budget, and not to what either the House or the Senate placed in the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Exactly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to ask the Senator one more question so that the point may be made clear. As I understand, if the Ferguson amendment is adopted it will carry with it the identical exemption as the amendment which was sponsored by the able Senator from Oregon, which the committee adopted. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. My understanding is that that would be the case. The amendment does not purport to change the language, and the limitation appears as a language change in each appropriative item for personal services.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that is the correct interpretation of the Ferguson amendment and the effect it will have, then the issue, and the only issue actually before the Senate in voting for or against the Ferguson amendment is whether in the judgment of each individual Senator we can safely reduce the amount to be expended for personal services another 5 percent; making it 10 percent instead of 5 percent, as now provided by the bill, under the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. Is that not correct?

Mr. CORDON. I am entirely in agreement with the Senator from Arkansas. He has stated the legal effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So, what we are talking about is the difference between 5 and 10 percent. We are all agreed on a cut. I presume the 5-percent cut has been adopted in the bill, by acceptance of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So the only issue with respect to the amendment is whether we will extend that cut to 10 percent.

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask one further question. If the bill goes to conference with the Ferguson amendment adopted, without the amendment of the able Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], providing exemptions for certain functions, the conferees may include in the conference report one or more of the items in which the Senator from New York is interested. So there would be an opportunity for further study in conference. There would be opportunity to include any of the other agencies which the conferees might wish to include, and which are covered by the amendment of the able Senator from New York. I think I am correct in that statement. I ask the able Senator if that is not a correct statement. If not, I should like to be corrected. I should like to have the situation clarified.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the bill as it now stands carries a specific dollar

ceiling on personal services for each item. That being so, each of the ceiling provisions will be in conference. The legal effect will be in conference. The amount will be in conference. The conferees might, of course, either delete all of a particular item, change the language, or change the figure. So the conferees would have complete control of all the items in the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wanted to get the situation clear in my mind. I intend to support the Ferguson amendment. I believe that the time has arrived to make reductions. We all talk economy, but when an effort is made on the floor of the Senate to do something about it, we say, "I believe in economy, but—"

I shall vote for the Ferguson amendment, just as I voted for the 10-percent cut in committee. But the point I wish to make is that there are some services which none of us want to curtail. We do not want to retard or hamper them. I am unwilling to make a cut which would do so.

I am not so certain but that a number of cuts could be made without any actual curtailment of service. In this period of crisis, when we are drafting the young men of the Nation and sending them to foreign battlefields to fight and die, there is not an employee of the Government, not a Member of Congress, who ought not to be willing to work a little harder and a little longer, and make a little sacrifice toward the contribution which is now necessary by effectuating some economy throughout the various agencies when American boys are making such great sacrifices.

I am going to vote for economy. I am going to vote to cut appropriations not only in this bill, but in the legislative bill. I think I could work an hour longer a day, or 2 hours longer a day, if necessary. I think the staff in my office could do so. If we are unwilling to do that for the sake of the country, for the purpose of effectuating some economies, then we are not willing to make contributions comparable to those which we are calling upon the young manhood of America to make in defense of freedom.

I believe that appropriations can be cut. I believe that as a matter of moral right we ought to cut them. We ought to demand of those who work for the Government a small measure of sacrifice in this period of crisis.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, let me say to my friend from Arkansas—and I say it from the bottom of my heart—that he has just said something which ought to be said again and again throughout the country, something which should be said and reiterated time and time again by the Executive head of this Nation to the people of the country. I join the Senator from Arkansas. I am willing to go as far as my judgment will permit me to go in making reductions.

With what information I have at this time—and I have endeavored to inform myself as best I could on this particular bill—I am of the considered opinion that it would be dangerous to cut this appropriation in the personnel field more than the committee has cut it. I can understand that other members of the committee may take a different view. I can only present my views and, so far as I can, the reasons for such views.

Mr. President, we have before us a \$2,000,000,000 bill, with about \$117,000,000 of it for personal services. Before the bill came to the committee the Bureau of the Budget had scanned it. I am not one of those who believe that the Bureau of the Budget is wholly an agency of extravagance. I have worked with the Bureau of the Budget in the years I have been in the Senate. I am personally acquainted with many of its personnel. I know that that agency strives to send to the Congress as sound a series of estimates as it can, not only with reference to personnel, but with reference to other items.

It is easy to stand on the floor of the Senate and, in sweeping generalities, say that all the employees in the executive departments are lazy louts and wastrels, or that all the supervisory group seek only selfish interest, and to pad payrolls. We can make such statements, Mr. President, but we are a bit reckless when we do so. They cannot be borne out by the facts.

Certainly in any organization so vast and stupendous as is the American Government, employing personnel at an annual cost of more than \$4,000,000,000 a year, exclusive of the national defense, there must be room to reduce personnel. The committee has sought, in connection with this first bill, to approach the reduction with a statutory limitation reducing the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget by 5 percent across the board, exempting only hospitals and direct medical aid.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether a representation which has been made to me is correct, namely, that a 5-percent cut or a 10-percent cut would actually amount to more than that in cash, by reason of the fact that the personnel removed would be entitled to receive pay which they had earned for their accumulated leave, so that the total amount of money actually taken out would be not only 5 percent, but perhaps an additional amount beyond that.

Mr. CORDON. If I correctly understand the Senator—

Mr. HAYDEN. I am referring to terminal leave payments which personnel involuntarily removed are entitled to receive in cash.

Mr. CORDON. I think I fully understand the Senator. If I do, I am in agreement with him. Under the law as the Congress has put it on the books, employees of the Federal Government may accumulate unused annual leave. If they are detached from the Government they are entitled to be paid at the reg-

ular rates for all of the period of accumulated leave which they have earned.

We have had various estimates from time to time before the committee with respect to the total amount of such accumulated leave. Although I am not certain, my memory is that it averages close to the limitation of 60 days per person. That means that if we apply a 5 percent limitation on the estimates for personal services as they appear in the budget, as a result of the necessity of paying for 60 days, or one-sixth of a year, of salary to each of the individuals who are detached, we actually increase the separation by considerably more than 5 percent, because we would make a reduction in money, not in numbers of personnel. If we attempt to make a reduction in numbers of personnel we are in a field of guesswork. We may take 10 percent of the personnel in the lowest brackets and hardly affect the budget. However, when we make a reduction in money—and that is the only way to cut down on personnel, if that is what we want to do—we do not appropriate the money. In that way the department must cut its suit out of the cloth we provide. With the 95 percent provided it must pay, first, those who are separated. If sufficient money is not available to pay for accumulated leave that must be taken into consideration when the personnel factor is applied to the money which is made available.

(At this point Mr. CORDON yielded to Mr. HUNT, who made a statement on the so-called Ferguson amendment. By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT's remarks were ordered to be printed at the conclusion of Mr. CORDON's speech.)

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A few minutes ago the Senator from Oregon made several observations in regard to the work which has been done by the committee and in regard to the work done by the Bureau of the budget. I agree with the Senator as to that. I myself know of several men in the Bureau of the Budget who are very well qualified for the work they are doing, and who are doing a good job in attempting to bring to both branches of the Congress a budget which they feel is justified.

I was not present in the committee at the time when the Senator from Oregon proposed his 5-percent-reduction amendment. It was presented at the meeting of the full committee, after I had to leave, just before the committee voted to report the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, let me say that I am fully aware of the responsible position the Senator from Nebraska has on the floor of the Senate, and of the fact that frequently he is required to be in the Senate Chamber at a time when he would prefer to sit with his own subcommittee or with the full committee; but it simply cannot be helped.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I highly respect him. He said he was presenting his own views, and he said he

felt that to make an additional cut of 10 percent in the appropriations would be dangerous at this time.

I should like to have the Senator from Oregon show—as he no doubt intends to do—the justification for making a 5-percent cut in the appropriations, and also why he believes it would be dangerous to make a further cut. In other words, I should like to have him present the arguments in favor of making a 5-percent cut and in opposition to making a 10-percent cut.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether he would have any objection to a unanimous-consent agreement limiting the time for debate both on the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan and, subsequently, on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I should think we could conclude action on one of these amendments today, and then, tomorrow, conclude action on the other one. I certainly hope that will be done. The independent offices appropriation bill will be ready for consideration by the Senate tomorrow evening.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly I have no objection to concluding action on the pending bill by means of any agreement which is satisfactory to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In response to the suggestion just made, let me say that so far as I am concerned, there is no objection to having an agreement reached in regard to limitation of debate at any time the Senate desires. However, before that is done, I feel that both the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and the amendment of the Senator from Michigan itself should be voted on, because they involve the entire basis for the cuts in appropriations which may be proposed by any other amendments; and when we conclude action on the so-called Ferguson amendment, we shall then be in a position to take up similar amendments.

Therefore, I hope no limitation will be placed on debate until we have completed action on the so-called Lehman amendment and the so-called Ferguson amendment. Then I am satisfied it will be perfectly agreeable to Senators on this side of the aisle to have the Senate limit debate in any way that is desired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I wish to have the so-called Ferguson amendment and also the so-called Lehman amendment voted on by the Senate without undue delay, but I do not wish those amendments to be voted on until the Senator from Oregon, who heard the testimony and who participated in the attempt in the committee to make a proper recommendation to the Senate, has an opportunity to present his views

in regard to the amendments. He is the one who recommended to the committee the 5-percent cut in the appropriations, and I think he should be allowed to inform the Senate why he favors such a provision.

We are not complaining about the attempt of the Senator from Michigan to have a 10 percent cut made—or even a 15 percent or a 20 percent cut made; but we are trying to convince the Senate that the sound course for it to follow, in making the proper kind of savings, is to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. Therefore, we wish the Senate to have the benefit of hearing the Senator from Oregon present his views and arguments, and then vote.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like now to give as direct an answer as I can to the suggestion of the minority floor leader. Let me say first that I cannot indicate with respect to any item in the bill specifically where a 5-percent cut can be safely made and a 10-percent cut cannot be made. My judgment is based to a very great extent upon the fact that 5 percent is 1 in 20, and 10 percent is 1 in 10. Among other things, the committee had before it the itemized list of the personnel, including the activities in which the several persons were expected to be engaged, and including the number of additional personnel, if any, requested in the proposed estimates, and I believe that when a careful scrutiny has been made by the Bureau of the Budget, and another careful scrutiny made by the committee, and all that information is taken into consideration, and we eliminate 1 in 20 of the persons employed in the civil departments of the Government, we shall have gone about as far as we ought to go, unless we are willing to give up our present system of appropriation by subjects and return to an itemized appropriation. If we return to that system, we shall have an appropriation bill consisting of perhaps 300 pages in the place of one consisting of 50 or 60 pages. We shall then have absolute control of the personnel, the expenses, and so forth, under an itemized list. In that way we could do a far better job than we do when we make single appropriations covering a great number of objects.

One might ask the same question which has been asked with respect to the difference between a 5 percent cut and a 50 percent cut. The difference again is, of course, 1 in 20 as against 1 in 2, and it is a matter of judgment for the Members of the Senate, most of whom have not had access to the detailed data, and it is a matter of judgment for the members of the committee, all of whom have had access to the data, although many have not had the opportunity to make the study which should be made.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure that the Senator has even attempted to figure it out nor am I sure that it can be done;

but I should like to ask, if it were possible to translate into dollars and cents the saving which is proposed in the Jensen amendment, as the committee finally modified it, what would the saving be, if it could be made—and I am not sure that it could be—as compared, let us say, to a cut of 5 percent?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, our study indicated that we were in a field of guess, after we had obtained all the information we could get. I do not assume to speak for the entire membership of the committee, though I heard some of the members discuss the matter, but the view of some of us was that the best that could be hoped for under the Jensen amendment was substantially a 5 percent reduction throughout the personnel level.

If I may revert for a moment to the Jensen amendment, the testimony before the committee was that separations throughout the Government service run from approximately 18 percent in certain agencies to as high as 36 percent in others. Those separations, of course, would begin immediately after the fiscal year, and would end with the close of the fiscal year. If we assume a steady rate of separations distributed throughout the year the average separation rate for the year would be these percentages divided in half, and we could then have a reasonable idea of the number of man-years, or average, to be gained if others could not be employed to take the place of those who were separated from the service. I mean that, with respect to the agencies in which the separation is around 18 percent, the average in man-years would be 9 percent, and that, with respect to those in which the separation is around 36 percent, it would be 18 percent.

However, we must have in mind, when we consider that matter, that the Jensen amendment as contained in the House bill, and the modified Jensen amendment which the committee considered, differed with respect to a specific provision for a ceiling which would be permitted in each agency before the amendment could become operative.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Why would it not be much simpler, I may ask the distinguished Senator, merely to adopt the budget which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] recommended, cutting it \$7,000,000,000 or \$8,000,000,000, instead of arguing about a little 5 percent cut on \$117,000,000? Would it not be better? A moment ago, the Senator from Oregon suggested that we might take up 300 different agencies or items. I ask again, why not take the Byrd budget, debate it, argue it, and settle it once for all in one debate?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to endeavor to answer the Senator. In my opinion, there is much to be said for that approach. I am one of those who last year supported the one-package appropriation bill. I still believe that it is the soundest approach to appropriations which the Congress

will ever evolve, because it is the only procedure by which the Congress can maintain control of the total appropriation until the last minute, when the bill is passed. Had we been able this year to carry that into effect, we could have done this year what we did last year, when we added section 1214 to the bill, and, in that section, cut the total appropriation by \$550,000,000; which sum was impounded and was not used, because not appropriated. In addition to that, there was \$30,000,000 more which was impounded, and I do not recall that there have been any great outcries because any essential activity was hurt. We cannot do that now. We are going to have our whole apple brought to us in some 12 or 13 segments. We must operate on each of the segments as it comes. I should prefer the other approach. I think it is the soundest approach. I think it is the one way whereby the entire Senate, despite the fact that many Senators never have the opportunity to work on the Appropriation Committee, can still use sound judgment in its final action. It can in that way look at the total necessities, the total expected income, and determine what relationship one should bear to the other, and, in one short section of such a bill, it can execute its judgment. That is the way it should be done. It is not being done in that way, and we must do the best we can with what we have.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did the Comptroller General endorse the Cordon amendment?

Mr. CORDON. The Comptroller General made no appearance and advised the committee not at all. Representatives of the Comptroller General's office were before the committee. Those who appeared before the committee joined with the Bureau of the Budget in the statement that the most logical method of making reductions in this or in any other appropriation bill would be the method of writing the reduced specific figures throughout the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that neither the representatives of the Comptroller General's Office nor of the Budget Bureau made any recommendations? We asked them what the approach should be. Is not that correct? It was committee action; it was not the action of the Budget Bureau or of the Comptroller General.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not want to dispute with the able chairman of the subcommittee. I am perfectly clear in my mind that representatives of both agencies were responsible for the statement to the committee that the soundest approach was the approach of specific figures.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct; but did not the committee ask them for that information?

Mr. CORDON. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was not voluntary on their part.

Mr. CORDON. They were brought before the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Because the committee wanted to arrive at some method of approach. Is not that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the questions we are asking the Senator are bringing out all the issues and the facts involved.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be happy to answer every question I can answer. I do not want to delay the Senate, because I think that what the Senator from Oregon has to offer is not of too much value.

Mr. WHERRY. If I did not think it was of value, I would not be asking questions; but I know the Senator from Oregon is one of our most industrious colleagues, and I appreciate his judgment.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to associate myself with his very pertinent remarks just made about the one-package appropriation bill, or the so-called Butler-Byrd bill, or however it may be identified. I think it was the proper way to legislate, and I am sure the Senator from Oregon knows, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I was in favor of it. I think that method of appropriation should be reinstated. It would be a great boon in helping the members of the committee and getting before the whole Senate in one package the total appropriations.

I should like to ask the Senator one question. What is the difference between the amount of saving which might be effected by the so-called Jensen amendment and the saving which might be brought about by the committee's modification of it? How much difference would there be if we could translate it into dollars? The provision will be in conference, and that is why I am asking the question. So long as it will be in conference as the Jensen amendment, I am wondering what the difference in saving might be between the Senate provision and the House provision, no matter what happens here in the final determination of the question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. In a moment.

Mr. President, there was no estimate before the committee from anyone as to the savings which would be effected by the Jensen amendment as it appears in the House version of the bill. It is wholly a matter of speculation. When one approaches consideration of the effect of an amendment, one is compelled to be wholly practical and to realize that if there is to be an average of 13 percent separation in a given agency—that is, if 13 percent of the total personnel at sometime during the year is to be separated under the conditions set forth in the Jensen amendment—the head of any agency, where that kind of a separation would result in a chaotic condition in the handling of the work of the

agency, would, at the beginning of the year, do everything he could do so to arrange his whole personnel pattern as to: First, keep as many of his personnel on the payroll as he could, and second, reemploy those individuals who are the most necessary in his particular employment pattern.

In the consideration of the effect of that kind of provision it must be remembered that it is not a matter of law; it is a matter of good common horse sense. We may assume, I think, that the Government agencies in general are not extravagantly overstaffed. They have not been culled as fully, perhaps, as they should be, and we know there are places where we could make reductions. We know that the average employee of the Federal Government and the average employee in industry, like the average employee of the United States Senate, is trying to do a good job and is a faithful servant endeavoring, to the best of his ability, to do the work he is called upon to do. But, Mr. President, when we consider the practical aspects of the situation, we are bound to come to the conclusion that if the supervisory head of any agency is faced with the application of an amendment along the lines of the Jensen amendment, and realizes that he can never know throughout the year when there will be a sharp change in his personnel because of resignation, death, or because of any of the reasons indicated in the amendment, he will do everything he can to keep on the job those who are now employed under him. To do that he will be willing to take less than able, faithful service from them. Only in that way can he protect his agency and its integrity in carrying out its assigned duty.

We must bear that in mind, because when we consider 13 percent of man-years out in a given year, we realize that many agencies could not function, and they would strive to do everything they could to change the percentage of separation. We do not know what that change will be. We do know that the percentage is bound to be less than it has been.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be happy to yield, if, by so doing, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may yield for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning tomorrow at 12 o'clock, the time for debate upon the Ferguson amendment be limited to 1 hour, to be divided equally between the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and that the time for debate upon any amendment to the Ferguson amendment be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from New Mexico if he is against the amendment, and, if not, between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished minority

leader; and that all amendments must be germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the agreement does not relate to a vote. As I understood the request, it relates only to limitation of debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And the limitation applies first to the so-called Ferguson amendment, on which it is proposed that a limitation of an hour be placed, with 30 minutes to the side.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Which I understand is agreeable to the Senator from Michigan. Then as to other amendments to the Ferguson amendment debate would be limited to 30 minutes on each amendment. It is not proposed to place a limitation on any other amendment to the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from North Dakota will reconsider. The request applies only to the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am willing to yield the 30 minutes controlled by me to the other side.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for another question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. My question does not relate to the unanimous-consent request. I appreciate that the Senator from Oregon is rendering a real service in bringing out all the facts and in trying to show what the end result might be under either the original Jensen amendment which is in the House language of the bill with which we will have to deal in conference, or the modified form, the proposed 5-percent cut. I wish the Senator would venture an opinion. I have heard various suggestions made, translated into dollars, with respect to what the original so-called Jensen amendment would produce, and what the modified form would produce. Will the Senator from Oregon furnish us with a guess as to what, in his judgment, the Jensen amendment would save? I realize, of course, that it is all a guess. A guess only can be made as to what the modified form of amendment would do. But when the bill goes to conference the conferees will be obliged to deal with the matter of dollars and cents. Would the Senator care to express himself percentagewise? If he does not wish to do so, very well. But I believe it to be highly important to find what would be the saving as translated into dollars, if possible, under the so-called Jensen amendment as it came to the Senate, even though it be only a guess, and also what would result from a 5-percent cut.

Mr. CORDON. I wish I could hazard even speculation with respect to the Jensen amendment, but I cannot do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. CORDON. I do not think anyone can do so. One could take the records of separations in years past of the several agencies and cut them in two, to allow

for the fiscal effect of the known separation rate spread over 12 months, then take average salaries with that weighted average, and finally arrive at a rough figure of what would have happened in some other year. When we arrived at that figure we would still be faced with the fact that it was not worth a continental in considering the same amendment applied prospectively because we would not have the same result, inasmuch as the amendment in itself would be a factor in determining future separation rates.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Cordon amendment goes into effect, the savings under the bill will be \$2,318,190.

Mr. CORDON. That would be the savings over and above the recommendations of the committee at the time the amendment was finally adopted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. That figure is shown in the report. What I am trying is, if possible, to get an approximate figure of savings that would be produced by the Jensen amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would result in employment of 1 person for every 4 vacancies, but what that would mean in savings in dollars and cents, I could not tell the Senator. Under the Cordon amendment there would be a saving of \$2,318,190 a year.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a few minutes more. I desire now to direct my remarks to the amendment offered to the Ferguson amendment, by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I fully realize the views which have been expressed by the Senator from New York as being sincere and coming from his heart. I realize that the only thought in his mind, and in the minds of other Senators who agree with him with respect to this matter, is that of maintaining the integrity of the humanitarian efforts which are now being made in the name of the Government to promote health and to protect life. I find myself, however, in disagreement, not with the views or the desires of the Senator, but only with respect to the effect of the Ferguson amendment, if adopted.

Let me say that I do not believe the Ferguson amendment should be adopted and applied to any provisions in the bill. I am of the opinion that if the Senate should adopt it, however, its adoption would not more seriously affect the several activities mentioned in the Senator's amendment than it will seriously affect the other activities denominated in the bill.

I call attention to certain figures taken from the budget in support of that statement. For the National Institute of Health the bill contains an item of \$15,800,000. Personal service accounts for \$4,800,532 of that amount; grants account for \$9,650,000 of it. Then there is

an item for other expenses. The Ferguson amendment would not attach to the grants of \$9,650,000, but only to the personal services item.

With respect to dental health we have a somewhat different picture, in that of the total estimate of \$1,750,000 personal services would represent \$1,053,848.

The total estimate for the Heart Institute is \$10,150,000, of which personal services account for only \$1,540,351, with grants representing \$7,591,000. The difference represents other expenses.

In the case of mental health activities, the total estimate is \$10,800,000, of which personal services represent only \$1,240,515, and grants \$8,182,000.

For the Cancer Institute the total estimate is \$15,122,000, of which personal services represent only \$2,836,590, with grants representing \$10,315,000.

In the case of foreign quarantine, where the whole operation almost is in personal services, the total estimate is \$3,000,000, with personal services representing \$2,639,430.

Mr. President, it is, of course, easy to make an argument in favor of each of these items in the bill, and certainly no one can deny the high purpose of the Congress in enacting the legislation providing for them, nor deny the necessity for work in the several fields. But, in all seriousness, I call the attention of my colleagues on the floor to what I believe is a demonstrable fact. The advances made in the medical sciences have resulted not from the expenditures of Federal dollars, but from the work done by a great number of devoted members of society working entirely on their own—working in the hospitals, in the clinics, in the great laboratories of the pharmaceutical groups, in the universities, and in the medical schools. That is where all the advance occurred until the last decade. We except only the work—and it has been a good work—done by the Public Health Service. But prior to that time that work was solely in the nature of instruction to local agencies in the several States. We have come from an average life expectancy of 35 years in the earliest years of the country to 70 at present. I think we can give credit to the men of medicine and surgery who were working in their private practice to accomplish the job which has been done.

It is altogether proper that the Government should come into the picture to some extent, because our tax system has guaranteed that there will not again be created in this country the great personal fortunes from which endowments were made in the past, which permitted much of this work to be done. Unless funds are now provided through taxation, we shall not continue to have support for these activities. We shall not continue to have the type of endowment which we have had in the past.

In the last analysis we shall not seriously injure these programs—if we injure them at all—by the kind of reduction which is here proposed, beyond the injury which would come from dislocation in connection with any of the other activities covered by the bill. I am of the opinion that when we make a 5-percent reduction we make all that we

should make, until we can reach the problem item by item.

One further point, and I am through. In the one-package bill last year we had section 1214, which was a rescission of \$550,000,000. That rescission was made effective by the Bureau of the Budget as a result of the knowledge which that Bureau had, from its inspection and study, of all the departments of government through past years. We can make such a reduction in this bill if it is the will of the Congress to do it. I present that problem to my colleagues so that they may study it.

In that connection, I should like to place in the Record the following figures:

In the civilian employment of the Federal Government we have for 1952 an estimated total payroll of \$4,232,727,846. That is exclusive of the Department of Defense.

For travel for 1952 the total of \$151,599,312.

For transportation of things, \$555,893,085.

For communication services, \$36,895,738.

For rents and utilities services, \$118,423,916.

For printing and reproduction, \$59,837,795.

For other contractual services, \$809,146,855.

For services performed by other agencies, \$132,387,712.

For supplies and materials, \$565,523,263.

For equipment, \$308,929,742.

For lands and structures, \$1,036,493,894.

For grants, subsidies, and contributions, \$3,431,746,126.

For pensions, annuities, and insurance losses, \$3,862,666,255.

For refunds, awards, and indemnities, \$17,575,156.

For interest, \$5,897,757,683.

For taxes and assessments, \$1,339,793,

For investments in lands, \$1,099,159,180.

There is an unvouchered amount of \$20,045,000.

There is a sum not distributed by budget class of \$72,796,273.

There is a total of direct obligations, exclusive of national defense, of \$22,477,944,623.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. One moment, and I shall be happy to yield.

With a total of \$22,000,000,000, certainly we can find places to wield the economy ax. If we can do it, then we must start here. In connection with each bill as it comes up we must do that which, when we finish the last bill, will represent what we could have done much more easily and logically had we been able to operate on a single figure of appropriation.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator mind reading the item for rents again?

Mr. CORDON. For rents and utility services, \$188,423,916.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator ever considered the question of compelling the Federal Government and the regional agencies to locate their central offices somewhere near the center of the particular region? For example, take the Office of Price Stabilization. The regional office was located at Minneapolis. The result is that in some cases a man from Montana must travel 1,200 miles or more to go to the regional office. In Minneapolis the rents are very high. They could be cut in two by locating the office in South Dakota or North Dakota, somewhere near the center. Two or three more regional offices are being established in that area. One is an office under the Department of Labor. It seems to me that the committee, or whoever is in charge of this matter, ought to call in whoever is responsible and try to have the regional offices located somewhere near the center of the area. It seems to me that such a plan would save a considerable sum.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the suggestion. I think that somewhere along the road the committee could well set a rental pattern for the United States and have shown on it the divisional headquarters of all the agencies, so that we could get the picture of where the principal offices are located and the areas which they serve.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think we could go further. I am not so much worried about the old departments, such as the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture. It is the new agencies which establish the pattern. They get employees from the other departments. Such employees probably were class 8 employees. All of a sudden they become class 14 employees. It is the new agencies which cost the Government money. I refer to OPS and similar agencies. They pay more money to the average employee. They take employees from the Department of Labor and from other old departments of the Government. They are taking them right now by the thousands. I think we should watch that sort of thing. We need not worry about the old departments. We do not let them get by with anything. The new agencies are the ones who are actually getting the money.

Mr. CORDON. In conclusion, Mr. President, I suggest to my colleagues who are interested in some sort of logical approach to the problem that a study be made of the committee's report on the bill. In that way it is possible to determine the action which was taken last year by the President's Bureau of the Budget in applying to each of the agencies what the Bureau of the Budget felt was the respective proper share of the \$550,000,000 recission. I refer to the tables beginning at page 19 of the report. The tables are headed "Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214," and so forth.

I wish to say to my colleagues that overnight I shall give some attention to

the tables. I believe that the proper approach to the bill would be to take the amendments which the committee has offered and make a recission along the lines of section 1214 of last year's general appropriation bill in the amount that the Senate feels the reduction should be made, and then leave it to the Bureau of the Budget to apply the reduction so that there will be used in that application all the accumulated knowledge of the one agency in the Government of the United States which has the necessary information to make that kind of application wisely.

During the delivery of Mr. CORDON'S speech,

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few more minutes. I understand that the Senator from Wyoming must catch a train. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him for a brief period of time.

Mr. HUNT. I ask for only 4 minutes.

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator. I do so with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I assure him that I shall keep within my 5-minute limitation. First of all, I wish to send to the desk an amendment to the Lehman amendment. I ask that the clerk read the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am interested in the parliamentary situation. Is it not a fact that an amendment offered to the Lehman amendment would be an amendment in the third degree? If so, I believe it would be out of order.

Mr. HUNT. If it is out of order, I shall withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that it is out of order.

Mr. HUNT. Then I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the Senator understands that I am not objecting to his amendment. I merely stated my understanding of the parliamentary situation. I am quite certain that he can propose his amendment in another way.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I believe that by the votes which were cast on last Friday it was indicated that the majority of the Senate are in total agreement with the necessity for greater economy in the Federal Government, especially at this particular time. I think we are obligated to cut every single program which is not needed. I believe we must join together to reduce any Federal activity which benefits only a few of the people, and to wipe out completely any Federal activity which would permit an increase of employment in the Federal Government. Let us cut and cut drastically programs which have gone beyond the intent of Congress, and those which can be deferred until a time

when the problems confronting us are far less urgent than those which now command our attention. I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I think he has more or less broken with a custom and rule of the Senate, in that he has cut \$112,000,000 from the House recommendation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HUNT. It is something in the nature of an entirely new procedure, as I understand.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As a general rule the Senate restores or raises appropriations acted on by the House. In this instance we have cut \$112,000,000.

Mr. HUNT. And the committee has cut \$215,000,000 from the budgetary requests. I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico and the committee for having done a splendid job.

Mr. President, I believe that in cutting various appropriations we must take great pains that we do not inadvertently destroy programs which are of great value to the Nation, whether it is at war or at peace. We must be sure that when we strike at nonproductive bureaucrats, we do not inadvertently drive from Government public servants whose contributions to the health of all our people and that of our armed services far outweighs the cost of their services. A flat percentage cut in all funds to pay employees in a large department of the Federal Government is a blind and unreasoning way to go about the matter. It would harm essential services as much as it would reduce non-essential services.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that it would drive out of Government the efficient and essential employee more quickly than the inefficient and nonessential employee.

For example, the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Michigan would cut off men at the National Institute of Dental Research whose work has been under constant observation by the American Dental Association, and which has won the continued approval of that knowledgeable and highly tax-conscious organization. It would cut off some of the men who helped find out that a few cents' worth of fluoride placed in city water supplies would halt tooth decay by 60 percent. Tooth decay has forced our Armed Forces to reject tens of thousands of potential servicemen during the two world wars and the present Korean incident.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUNT. I would prefer not to yield at this time. I am racing against time in an attempt to catch a train. Therefore, I decline to yield at this time.

Furthermore, the amendment would cut off some of the already all-too-few physicians at the National Institutes of Health, who also happen to be the scientists who inspect and thus insure the safety and effectiveness of the vaccines which protect our children against diphtheria and smallpox, and our soldiers overseas against typhus and yellow fever. Those vaccines now are the purest and the most potent in the entire world. It

is absolutely necessary that they be kept so. I may say, Mr. President, that deaths in Korea from infectious and contagious diseases today are practically nil. It is due to the magnificent work of the research men down through the years.

The amendment would drive away from their test tubes many scientists and technicians at the National Cancer and Heart Institutes who are trying to find means of preventing or curing those two great killers, cancer and heart disease. The highly skilled, dedicated men of mental disease, of cerebral palsy, of arthritis, and blindness, are unfortunately also included among the bureaucrats which the amendment seeks to purge.

These are the types of men and women who have been serving our Nation and humanity in the laboratories of the Public Health Service—men and women who, if we adopted the Ferguson amendment in its present form, would be told that their work is no longer needed, that the Congress does not approve what they are doing.

Mr. President, I know that is not the intent of Congress. I know that when we move to cut down the size of the army of Federal employees we want to do so selectively and with intelligence and on the basis of knowing just what each platoon in that army is engaged in doing. By all means let us make cuts in the swivel-chair commandos, but let us not make cuts in the platoons which are out in front on the firing line—the men and women who have dedicated themselves to the continuous war on death and disease, the men and women who could command far greater salaries and could live far less dangerously if they had not chosen to put public service ahead of private gain. Let us tell the men and women who are doing the research, and the planning and the testing at the National Institutes of Health that we will give them the opportunity to continue in their careers of self-sacrifice. We can and we should do so by voting in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I wonder whether all Members of the Senate realize that when our Nation was founded, 161 years ago, the average life expectancy was 35 years, whereas today it is 70 years. Incidentally, let me say that many of the present Members of the Senate are now enjoying that added life expectancy, due to the work which the scientists and research workers have done in years gone by.

Just at the turn of the century the average workingman was absent from his job 21 days a year because of illness, whereas today the average workingman loses only 8 days a year because of illness.

Only 15 or 20 years ago in my own State I often visited local hospitals and saw men who suffered from spotted fever, a disease caused by the bite of wood ticks. The Public Health Service established at Hamilton, Mont., a laboratory for the sole purpose of developing a vaccine for tick fever. That was done. Whereas in Wyoming 15, 20, 25 or more years ago,

there were hundreds of deaths from spotted fever, today there are no deaths from that disease, a result which has been accomplished because of the work done by the scientists who have engaged in research on spotted fever.

Mr. President, I am most hopeful that the Senate will not adopt blindly the proposed meat-ax approach, by which it is proposed to cut off the heads, so to speak, of the scientific and research workers in our Government establishment.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Without objection, the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming will be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, 1951

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, from the Committee on Appropriations, House Joint Resolution 267, making an additional appropriation for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes; and I request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that the joint resolution calls for an additional appropriation of \$150,000 for expenses of inquiries and investigations of the Senate. The balance remaining in the appropriation for this purpose is inadequate to meet the payrolls which are due on June 15, 1951, and during the remainder of the fiscal year. So passage of the joint resolution at this time is necessary, in order that the employees may be paid.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this an appropriation for the contingent fund of the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the purpose of the appropriation to replenish that fund to the extent of the money which is needed under authorizations we have already made?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas, if the Senator will yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. A little while ago the Senator from Arkansas said this is a time for sacrifice. I wish to inquire whether the joint resolution comes in that category, in the opinion of the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. All these bills come in that category—both this measure and the other measures referred to come un-

der the category referred to by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall not object to the request, but I wonder whether we should make a 10-percent reduction in the appropriations carried in this measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; for it applies to the present fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 267) making an additional appropriation for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, during the debate earlier today many statements and comments were made from which the inference might be drawn that Congress has not been sympathetic to an orderly expansion of our public health service program. I was aware of the extensive expansion over the past decade, and I requested the staff of the Committee on Appropriations to prepare an accurate summary showing appropriations for the public health service annually since 1941.

It is probably interesting and significant to note that in the fiscal year 1941 the total appropriation for the public health service was \$33,379,340, whereas the estimate for this year is \$362,693,000, with the bill as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations providing for approximately \$359,000,000. That means that since 1941 there has been more than a ten-fold increase, or approximately from \$33,000,000 to \$362,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that in the pending bill the amount recommended by the subcommittee is a 32½-percent increase over 1951 expenditures.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The average number of employees of the Public Health Service in 1941 was 10,877, whereas the estimated personnel of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1952 is 16,103.

Mr. President, I have cited the figures primarily to show that Congress has not lacked sympathy for and that there has been an orderly expansion of the entire program. No one should stand on the floor of the Senate and charge that Congress has been niggardly in the consideration of appropriations for the Public Health Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the summary to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Public Health Service

Year	Appropriation	Average employees
1941.....	\$33,379,340	10,877
1942.....	42,476,939	13,026
1943.....	58,037,245	17,465
1944.....	114,232,980	17,555
1945.....	126,925,073	16,098
1946.....	124,368,311	16,699
1947.....	104,096,446	16,727
1948.....	131,283,100	17,109
1949.....	168,521,000	16,952
1950.....	201,062,500	16,388
1951.....	274,794,280	16,049
1952, estimate.....	362,693,000	16,103

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to speak on the bill if there is to be any limitation of time tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. No; there is no limitation of time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I made some observations this afternoon in which I expressed myself rather candidly and frankly about the work of the subcommittee. I stand by what I have said.

I wish to get at the subject in an indirect way. Tomorrow morning the Committee on Banking and Currency will consider and possibly start marking up the Defense Production Act, on which the committee has been taking testimony for approximately 30 days. We will again hear all about the changes. We will again hear all the old hokum about price control. We will again hear what we have heard for many days gone by. We will hear all the old arguments. For all practical purposes, OPA will be back again. I am reminded of the old song:

OPA is back again, the skies above are black again.

Black markets are back again, OPA is here again.

We will have very much of the same thing. In listening to the testimony, I have been puzzling over it, and I have come to the conclusion that there is some virtue in the old formula that high prices are the result of volume of money times the velocity of turn-over of money, divided by the availability of goods. That seems to be the standard formula by which orthodox economists give us the clue to price control.

Let us take these factors in order to understand the bill. First of all, let us take the velocity factor. The Federal Reserve Board at long last is moving in with its credit controls and is trying to cut down the money velocity and turn-over. I have said on occasions that it is rather strange that the Federal Reserve Board waited so long. The act went on the books in September of last year. Evidently there was no interest in doing anything about it until after election day. Then things got under way, and prices began to go up. Now for the first time we begin to see the teeth of the Federal Reserve Board's regulations in the form of regulation W and regula-

tion X, and the regulations are having some effect.

We have had before us persons interested in the radio and television business. Senators can believe it or not, but there are now 600,000 television sets in storage because it is impossible to move them. That shows that the Federal Reserve regulations are finally beginning to work. That is one factor in the price formula.

The next factor is supply. If only we could hike up the amount of consumer goods. It seems that we always go in for the usual emotional binge and always get the cart before the horse. We impose restrictions which retard the development of a supply of consumer goods rather than making it easy.

My good friend, the Senator from Nebraska, is an expert in the field of beef. The other day I saw in a Washington newspaper an article stating that the packers were staging a sit-down strike. I looked at the market price in Chicago. On the 5th of June, 27,000 cattle reached the Chicago market—50 percent of what would reach it in normal times. My friend, the Senator from Nebraska, knows that quite well. Today there is a quota on the packers and a shortage of supply, and prices went up \$1 or \$1.50 per hundred. The packers could not buy cattle at that price, because they are operating on a ceiling, and they could not jeopardize their investment. So the cattle moved down the highways, and little slaughtering establishments were set up behind barns and elsewhere; but the problem is not solved at all.

If we can do something about supply, that will ease the control problem.

If we can do something about the velocity of credit that will ease the problem.

Another factor is money and the volume of money.

While we in the Congress talk about price controls, we vote to pour money into the economic bloodstream in tremendous amounts. We have before us a budget calling for the appropriation of \$71,500,000,000, and supplemental and deficiency appropriation bills which have been passed call for further appropriations of more than \$1,500,000,000, and I anticipate that other deficiency and other supplemental appropriation bills will come before us and will be enacted, with the result that in the fiscal year 1952 we may have an \$80,000,000,000 budget, rather than a \$71,500,000,000 budget. The demands for the appropriations will come from a variety of sources.

The approach to this matter seems to be by way of the ECA, subsidies, public hearings, and increases in the expenditures provided in the appropriation bills. I think we can prove it, because this year when the House passed the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, it contained items calling for the appropriation of \$88,000,000 more than was appropriated in the 1951 bill; and when the House finished acting on that bill, the amount carried in it was \$11,000,000,000 under the budget, but \$6,000,000,000 over the 1951 appropriations for the same agencies.

Further to prove the point which has been made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, let me say that I was defeated in my effort to head off Senate bill 445. There were a good many mistaken estimates in regard to what that bill would cost; but when I concluded my references to the testimony, I showed from the records made in the Appropriations Committee, at its own hearings which were taken last year, that Senate bill 445 would not cost \$21,000,000, as my friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], estimated it would cost, but would cost \$240,000,000, with \$80,000,000 coming from the Federal Treasury and \$160,000,000 coming from State and local sources.

A few days ago the Senate passed the central Arizona project bill, authorizing the expenditure of \$788,000,000. However, when the construction of that project is begun, if prices go up, I have an idea the project will cost nearer \$1,000,000,000 than \$788,000,000.

The other day when the Senate had before it the dispersal bill, authorizing the appropriation of \$107,000,000 for that purpose, I helped fight that bill. I know that the authors of the bill were not particularly happy about what I said then; but what I said with gusto and enthusiasm and conviction was that if there is a real danger to our country the danger lies more nearly on the inside than on the outside.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator from Illinois has a point with reference to other agencies of the Government, but I wish to have him appreciate the fact that our subcommittee did try to make a cut in these appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the Senator's subcommittee did; I have no doubt about it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly we did not make enough cuts. However, let me ask whether the Senator has ever seen a Senate Appropriations Committee report an appropriation bill making reductions of \$112,000,000 in the appropriation items carried in the bill as it was passed by the House? Has the Senator from Illinois ever seen that done before?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, I wish to say with modesty to my friend the Senator from New Mexico that when I was a Member of the House of Representatives we had a standing canard that "the House took it out, but the Senate put it back in."

Mr. CHAVEZ. However, in this instance our subcommittee voted to make smaller appropriations than the ones the House had voted for.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is good.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I am trying to make to the Senate, namely, that in the subcommittee we tried to do what we thought was proper; we tried to make what we thought were proper cuts, and still provide sufficient money for the efficient operation of the functions of the Government appropriated for by the pending bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. President, there was the dispersal bill; there was the central Arizona project bill; and there is on the calendar Senate bill 337, providing subsidies for students and for universities. It is wonderful, it is desirable; but in heaven's name, when we confront such a condition as now exists, we must think in terms of the welfare of the entire country, for one thing; and, in the second place, we must decide whether we do a service to the country by taking more dollars from the pockets of the taxpayers when it cannot be shown that we make a better disposition of those dollars when we syphon them into the Government pool.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understood the Senator from Illinois to refer to Senate bill 337, and I understood him to refer to it as a bill making grants to students and universities. I assume the Senator realizes that those grants would not be made to liberal-arts universities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that.

Mr. LEHMAN. The grants would be made to medical schools, for the training of doctors, nurses, and others who are safeguarding the health of the people of our country, both those in the military forces and those in civil life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I wish to say to my friend the Senator from New York that I understand that fully; and many youngsters in my home county are belaboring me about that bill and are asking, "When is the Senate going to pass the bill?" so that they will be helped and so that the schools they attend will be helped. It is wonderful. However, I wish to say that when I was a student there was no such help.

Let us not forget that all these funds must come from the Federal Treasury. The pressure to provide more funds is constantly upon the Government. I apprehend that as time passes there will be other bills calling for additional appropriations from the Federal Treasury, and all of them will be outside the budget. So the question is, Where are we to stop increasing appropriations, and when are we to start making cuts?

That was the reason for my observation this afternoon that, frankly, I do not believe the Senate wants to economize, and I am beginning to doubt whether the House wants to economize. Those who really favor making cuts in the appropriations are in favor of only one thing, and that is the thing which has been emblazoned so long by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who says, "I have only one measuring rod, and that is the good of my country."

So, Mr. President, desirable though the various projects may be, we must think of the whole country and of the impact of these appropriations on the budget. If we put all requests for additional appropriations through the wringer, we shall not be worrying about the making of exceptions and about how much we shall appropriate for the control of ve-

nereal disease, for instance, and we shall not be concerned then about what we shall do about this item or that item, because what will count will be the effect on the good of the whole country, and then all of us will be scampering in the same direction.

Today we have an astronomical budget. In 1950 I spoke before many people, saying to them, "If you expect me to go to Washington and get you money out of the Federal till, you are badly mistaken. I do not propose to do it. I propose to see the good of the whole country benefited, and the knife will go deeply into all requests for further spending."

Mr. President, that brings up the question, What about the so-called meat-ax technique? I was intrigued by the observations of my colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in regard to using the scalpel. It is great business if we can use the scalpel to good effect.

I used to say that we must use a meat ax. There is today a Member of the Senate who once was a member of the President's Cabinet. I remember when I voted to use the meat-ax technique on the appropriations for the Government department he then headed, when I was chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee in the House of Representatives. We voted to take \$131,000,000 out of the appropriations for that department, although later the Senate voted to restore \$80,000,000 of the amount. Yet I remember when that gentleman came to my office and said, "We can work under that reduction."

So, Mr. President, when we are confronted with a budgetary danger of this sort, I think it is our responsibility to reduce the budget, balance the appropriations with the income, and say that is reasonable. Otherwise the inflationary spiral will become infinitely worse.

I return now to the formula, high prices are the result of volume of money, times the velocity or turn-over of money, divided by the availability of goods. If it is possible to hike up production, good. If it is possible to curtail credit and to curtail velocity, good. But there comes a third factor, the volume of money, and that is where the Congress comes in, because it has exclusive power over the purse, and if it is not controlled here, it is not going to be controlled anywhere. That is why it is necessary to use a scrutinizing eye upon every appropriation bill which comes from the committee. I do not quarrel with the good work which is done. I simply say that, as an individual Member of the Senate, I am dissatisfied, that is all, because, if what is now presented is the only showing we can make, then I doubt very much that we are going to make a proportionately better showing on the other bills which will be coming from the committee. Then what happens to our hopes, our dreams that we can save \$4,000,000,000, \$5,000,000,000, or \$7,000,000,000?

So let us now take a little look at the pending bill. The appropriation contained in the pending bill for Labor-Security is \$2,437,000,000. The budget estimates were \$2,744,000,000. That is

roughly a budget estimate for Labor-Security of \$300,000,000 in excess of the appropriation for last year. On that basis of that, one is almost warranted in saying that the President does not want the appropriation cut, and that the Budget Bureau does not want it cut, judging from the estimates they have sent to the Congress.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator not kindly tell the Senate that, of the billions of dollars he is talking about, most of the amounts are grants to the States, including the Senator's State, my State, and every other State?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; I shall come to that. I want to be entirely fair. First, let us consider the House action. For a certain item the House allowed \$90,000,000, of which \$50,000,000 was for old-age assistance. That is correct; is it not? At this point I want to say that I think my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was correct when he said that the saving indicated by the committee was only a frothy saving, because, as I read Miss Goodwin's testimony before the Senate subcommittee, there are going to be additional requests for permanent-disability grants, for dependent children, for other dependents, and for old-age assistance. Are we going to have the same procedure we have had before? If my figures are correct, every year since 1944 the item has been cut, and every year since 1944 the agencies have come back for a deficiency. Now, is that correct, or is it not? If it is correct; that is all there is to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, neither a committee nor the Senate itself can tell what a department is going to do, but, as a matter of fact, so far as the committee is concerned, and so far as the particular bill which we are discussing is concerned, we said "We will cut it down so much." Is not that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, but what I want to emphasize this afternoon—

Mr. CHAVEZ. The thing the Senator is emphasizing might be, "Come and ask us for more money." Of course, we do not know that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. An economy is not an economy, in the accepted sense of the word, until the books are closed for the fiscal year, a line is drawn, and we can say, "We did it." If the amount is completely restored within the fiscal year, we simply are not accomplishing anything.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That might be true, in the case of a supplemental bill, but so far this bill is concerned, the Senator will agree with us that we cut it, will he not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly, and I do not quarrel about it. I merely want to find out about it, that is all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What we shall do in the future, I, of course, do not know. I

hope the Senator is incorrect, and that the agencies will not come back for more money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The committee took approximately \$103,000,000 out of the public assistance appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The committee then took approximately \$50,000,000 out of the Railroad Retirement Board item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So that the committee shows decreases amounting to somewhat over \$153,000,000. The committee then shows about \$41,000,000 in increases. So the committee shows a net decrease of about \$112,000,000. But there is one item which in my judgment was a bookkeeping transaction, namely, the railroad retirement pension account. The other one, unless all signs fail, as they did not fail in the past 7 years, will be put back. So it leaves us in this situation, and this is the point I emphasize: Where is there shown any substantial economy that will stick? That is the important consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. In this particular bill the appropriation is \$112,000,000 less than the House figure. What else could we do?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I like a cut which, unlike an old soldier, does not simply fade away before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The apparent saving in the retirement fund, indicated in the report, is not really a saving at all, is it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; in my judgment, it is not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not correct that the amount of money used here may be such that we shall have to place in the bill next year all the dollars which we took out this year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And is not the same true in regard to the reduction of \$100,000,000 for public assistance, and so forth?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that, in effect, it is true, is it not, that we are not thereby saving a real dollar of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that we have, in fact, added \$41,000,000 to the House figure?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, no. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Last year the Department came to Congress with a supplemental budget estimate of \$40,000,000, which they received. They came forward with a \$120,000,000 supplemental bill, and we cut it down by \$40,000,000. This year they have unobligated balances of \$100,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but the Senator must remember that the record shows that Miss Goodwin also said to the Senator's committee that for permanent disability they expected that for 1952 the

demands would be 142 percent of the demands for 1951.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They may want that much and the Senator would apparently like to have Miss Goodwin decide the matter for the committee. The committee did not so decide. The committee has its bill before the Senate now. Of course, Miss Goodwin may submit a request, and if the Senators think her request should be granted, that is a different thing. But the committee has not done so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; but the Senator must be sure that the record is straight. The appropriation is governed by a statute, with a formula, and the committee would be helpless in denying a deficiency in the event the Department came forward and said, "The State spent the money in the first instance; these are matchable funds; and here is the bill."

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct, I think, as a formula; but I do not think it is going to be so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has to be done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. All I ask the Senator from Illinois to do is to trust the Senate Appropriations Committee, and to believe that the members of that committee are as sincere in their desire to save money as is any Senator, regardless of who makes the request, whether it is Miss Goodwin or someone else. As the Senator stated a little while ago, the House might make a cut in the hope that the Senate would restore it. In this particular case, we not only did not restore it, but we cut it \$112,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is completely different from the state of mind that is sometimes alleged to govern Senate behavior.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had hoped that the Senator's subcommittee would take account of the problems now involved in old-age assistance. Mr. Ewing is trying to deny to the State of Indiana \$20,000,000 because the legislature, in February, passed a statute requiring that a list of the names of the recipients of old-age benefits be open to public inspection. It is one way to prevent abuses. A joint committee of the Legislature of Tennessee made an investigation and submitted an astonishing report. In the State of Florida, I understand, the same thing has happened. That is a subject on which there should have been some testimony, and in that field the Senator's committee could have done some worth while work.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator has mentioned Indiana and Tennessee. It was the testimony in reference to Tennessee and Indiana which made it possible for the committee to recommend the cuts. Notwithstanding the fact that the chairman of the committee was from Tennessee, and notwithstanding certain generally economical people from Indiana, it was the situations in Indiana and Tennessee which justified the committee in making the cuts; and we made them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I know is that in the report it is stated in crystal-clear print that the amount is over the 1951 budget for the Department of Labor, and over the 1951 budget for the Federal Security Agency, although we are wrest-

ling with an acute problem which is pressing on the country and which imperils and jeopardizes vital security at home, so that we cannot overlook a single opportunity to make a cut.

If we follow the argument made here this afternoon, I could make the same argument as to every bill that comes before the Senate. When the agricultural bill is under consideration and an effort is made to reduce the appropriation for animal husbandry or for the eradication of cattle disease and insect pests, I can say, "You are jeopardizing the very food supply and the well-being of the country." That argument can be made as to any appropriation bill that comes before the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I come to this conclusion, that somehow, somewhere, sometime there must be those identified with the branch of the Government which has power over the purse, who will simply say, "We will walk down the middle of the road," because, when the President said to the public, "Prepare to accept some reductions in the standard of living," which is another way of saying, "You have got to go in for austerity," I think it is right for the people, through their elected representatives in the Congress, to say, "Look, Mr. Government, you must accept some austerity, too." So let us cut back the appropriations. That is why I am for the Ferguson amendment, and I would go even further than it goes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We want to be fair in the debate. The Senator from Illinois has stated that the committee has been neglectful. But a look at page 2 of the report of the committee will disclose that the appropriation for the Department of Labor, which is included in this bill, is \$7,369,759 less than for last year, and for the Federal Security Agency the appropriation is \$25,420,215 less than for last year. What more can be expected of us? After all, Federal Security has to carry on. I wish the Senator from Illinois would read the statements.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have been through the big green book.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This is the way the hearing started:

The committee, as the Secretary will understand, is confronted this year with a somewhat different problem in its consideration of budget estimates. There is the necessity to provide adequately for the defense of our country, for which we have a tentative estimate in excess of \$60,000,000,000. There is before the Congress a recommendation from the President proposing a substantial increase in taxes.

We said, "If you do not cut, we shall cut. Tell the committee where you can cut." They did not cut, and we did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to conclude, because I do not want to keep the Senate in session any longer, but I desire to stop on this note, that recently I saw a statement made by my good friend Lindsay Warren, a former Member of the House, who is now the Comptroller General. He made the observation that he took 7,000 persons out

of the General Accounting Office. An administrator in Government said, "I would not go through the experience you went through for anything in this world."

I thought it was rather revealing that there is great reluctance to use the ax in these agencies. There is only one thing we can do, and that is to use it here, and, by pressure, compel economies.

There was a top-echelon man in my office this morning who said to me, "We are over-staffed in my agency by 25 percent, but I can say nothing about it."

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree completely with the Senator from Illinois. I think personnel can be cut to the extent of 10 percent and still do a better job for the Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to hear that, because it means that my friend from New Mexico is going to support the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I am not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It provides for only a 10-percent reduction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We listened to the hearings and considered the stern realities. From the political angle there is no particular reason why I should agree with the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Cordon), but he is sincere and he is a fine citizen. He tries to work out the proper way of handling appropriations. The Senator from Oregon, after working assiduously, would have liked to cut 10, 15, or 20 percent, and so would I. But after the hearings we came to the conclusion that the proper, the decent, the common-sense procedure, if we were not to interfere with the operation of Government, was to cut 5 percent. That is why I am supporting the Cordon amendment. We would cut 20 or 50 percent, but that would not be the proper course to pursue, if we take our duties seriously. I sincerely think that a cut of 5 percent is the best we can do on this bill. We might be able to cut the State Department 20 percent or possibly 40 percent, and I may go along with the Senator along that line. But in considering the appropriations for health, education, Federal Security, and the Children's Bureau, I do not believe it is wise to cut by more than 5 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I respond to that by saying that when we take the "my" out of "economy," we are on pretty good ground, and then we can courageously use the ax. That does not mean being reckless. But it takes something more than a scalpel to whittle the expenditures of the Government back to safe proportions. If we have the temerity to say to the people, "Next year we are going to ask you for \$7,500,000,000 in taxes," we should, with equal grace, say, "We are going to give you \$7,500,000,000 reduction to balance the taxes."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator agree with me that while we should cut and try to conserve the taxpayers' dollars, due consideration should be given to individual items? I believe, that we should not reduce the appropriations for public health in the bill, but should make the cut in the ECA item. I think we could take some out of the North Atlantic Pact appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The sentiment was expressed today by Members of this great deliberative body, "I am for economy, but." I think Shakespeare once said, "But me no buts."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Illinois has indicated that the President made a statement some months ago about economy in government, but so far, I am sure the Senator from Illinois will agree the President has not come before the Congress and asked that any particular item be cut from the budget.

On Saturday, June 9, he wrote a letter, from which I wish to read certain paragraphs:

The Federal Government, as the largest single employer in the country, should set the example in accomplishing this objective.

He was talking about cutting down manpower.

Therefore, I expect the head of each executive department and agency to take all necessary actions to conserve manpower and generally to bring about maximum effectiveness and economy in the utilization of personnel.

This manpower conservation program should be given top priority through the executive branch.

All we are trying to do here is to help the President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Help him give it top priority.

Mr. FERGUSON. Give it top priority, and take it out even before he sends it here and actually asks for it. I am surprised that he did not write to Congress and ask Congress to do what he asked Mr. Lawton, his Director of the Budget, to do. Then he could have had worthwhile action on the budget. Does not the Senator from Illinois agree?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, indeed, I agree.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I also agree with my friends the Senators from Michigan and Illinois. The only point I am trying to make is that in cutting we should cut at the proper place where no great harm will be done. Let us not, having in mind the common weal and the interest of public welfare, cut where a cut would be detrimental to the welfare of the country.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Where would the Senator from New Mexico suggest that a cut be made? Will he name the place?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. Cut anywhere except where it involves the public health of the American people. Cut anywhere else.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator from New Mexico name the departments and the agencies where we should cut?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think cuts can be made in any department. But I think it would be against the interests of public welfare to cut any appropriation that affects the health of the American people.

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor. Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand that my amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on behalf of himself and other Senators, remains the pending question?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from New York to the so-called Ferguson amendment is the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

RELEASE BY SENATOR FERGUSON ON PROPOSAL FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF THE CHINA LOBBY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement released to the press yesterday by me, commending the President for his offer of full cooperation in a congressional investigation of what has been termed by the newspaper as the China lobby. This commendation is recorded on the assumption that the President's offer embraces an investigation of all elements which have sought to influence United States policy on China, including the pro-Communists as well as the pro-Nationalists.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

Those of us who have experienced the obstructionism of the executive branch in the past can only commend the President for his announced desire that Government agencies "cooperate to the fullest extent possible" in any congressional investigation of the "Chinese lobby" in the United States.

This commendation holds good, however, only to the extent that the President intends cooperation in an investigation of all elements that have sought to influence the course of this country's far eastern policy. Those elements include not only those which have supported the Chinese Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai-shek but those which have supported the Chinese Communists.

There can be no doubt of the wisdom of an inquiry into all the factors and factions behind our far eastern policy. That was precisely an objective of Republicans when they urged the so-called MacArthur hearings, which are now in progress.

Certainly the supporters of the Chinese Nationalists should be examined on the motives and the merits of their operations in this country. Likewise there should be full inquiry into the motives and organized operations of those who urged abandonment of United States support of the Nationalists; the proposition that the Chinese Communists were mere agrarian reformers devoid of Soviet domination; recognition of the Chinese Communist regime by the United States; seating of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations; and other related policies sympathetic to or designed to bring about Communist domination in China and nearby areas.

Some of these factors the joint Foreign Relations-Armed Services Committee of the Senate has sought to explore as collateral issues. Obviously they go beyond the already burdened scope of that committee, and that is what gives significance to the President's wishes as relayed by Secretary Acheson, that cooperation be extended "any committee or

committees of the Congress which wish to go into this matter for the purpose of informing them what is known, for the purpose of helping any investigation, for the purpose of assisting them to come to a conclusion as to whether or not they wish to have one."

Starting points for such an investigation, insofar as it would relate to the pro-Communist factors in the lobby which has sought to influence our China policy, are the Amerasia case and its unexposed ramifications, and the well known but hitherto disclosed activities of the Sorge spy ring maintained in Asia by the Soviets and its lobbying activities in the United States designed to put the Communists in control of China. As a matter of fact the subversive activities subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has already launched preliminary activity in similar directions, and I know that subcommittee will welcome most enthusiastically this offer of assistance from the executive branch.

We should assume the good faith of the President in making his offer of Executive cooperation "to the fullest possible extent," and we should feel free to assume that the offer embraces an inquiry into both anti-Communist and pro-Communist phases of lobbying on China policy. This is highly commendable, because it reveals again the high regard which President Truman held for the function of congressional investigations while he was a Member of the Senate, and for a reversal of the attitude toward them which he has displayed in more recent years as President.

Such a reversal will go far to overcome the effects of his stubborn obstructionism in refusing to make security information on Government employees available to committees such as that which investigated the Government loyalty program and the case of William Remington, which kicked back so explosively when Remington was later convicted as a Communist, and his characterization of congressional investigations into the Remington and Alger Hiss cases as "red herings."

If the President's pledge is one of full cooperation to investigate both the supporters of the Chinese Nationalists and the Chinese Communists it is a praiseworthy reversal of his past attitudes and a great step forward in the national interest.

Should it develop that it applies only to an investigation of anti-Communists, however, the offer is a snare and a delusion as it will appear to be only an effort to cover confusion and error within his own administration, whose policies have been opposed to the Chinese Nationalists.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees. (For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Peter I. Bukowski, of Illinois, to be

Deputy Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert I. Millonzi, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; I am willing that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of Mr. Bukowski.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

That concludes the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 12, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 11 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Harold R. Medina, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Hon. Learned Hand, retired.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Edward Jordan Dimock, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. George Murray Hulbert, deceased.

Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. Alfred C. Cox, retired.

Thomas F. Murphy, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. Harold R. Medina, elevated.

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and sections 303 and 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from October 19, 1950

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Shankle, Willard Mayes, 4161A.
Hook, Fred G., Jr., 4162A.
Kunkel, John Howard, Jr., 4163A.
Hunziker, Richard Overton, 4164A.
Burbridge, Leo Michael, 4165A.
Oliver, Frank Everell, 4166A.
Clarke, Leo George, Jr., 4167A.
Knox, Jonathan Horace, 4169A.
Hedlund, Earl Clifford, 4170A.
Read, Jackson Yulee, 4171A.
Eaton, Robert Reynolds, 4172A.

Beezley, Wilbur Barrett, 4173A.
Montgomery, Robert Pearson, 4174A.
White, John Milton, Jr., 4175A.
Halberstadt, Harry Julius, 4177A.
Christy, Harrison Randolph, Jr., 4178A.
McBride, William Peter, 4179A.
Bourne, Evan Francis, Jr., 4180A.
Bowman, Julian Holt, 4181A.
Blachly, Ross Lindley, 4182A.
Baker, Basil Lee, 4183A.
Hargett, William Marion, 4184A.
Bell, John Howard, 4185A.
Allen, Harry Berkley, 4186A.
Quayle, John William, 4187A.
Wittrock, Howard Henry, 4188A.
Jones, Osce Vernon, 4189A.
Morton, Charles William, 4190A.
Grove, Philip Pike, 4191A.
Nichols, John Donaldson, Jr., 4192A.
Graves, John Calvin, 4193A.
Warren, Benjamin Calvert, 4194A.
Vetort, Francis John, 4195A.
Black, Vance Eugene, 4197A.
Keating, Robert Edward, 4200A.
Beaudry, Emil George, 4201A.
Faver, Dudley Ervin, 4202A.
Scott, Edward Walcott, Jr., 4203A.
Fandel, William Herbert, 4204A.
Hydron, Clarence August, 4206A.
Eaton, Dudley Paul, 4207A.
Cormier, Lionel Joseph, 4208A.
Mitchell, Richard Randolph, 4209A.
Ferguson, Harvey Eugene, 4210A.
Cloe, Keith DeLyle, 4211A.
Haesler, John Dietrich Walter, 4212A.
Slisk, Eugene Bounds, Jr., 4213A.
Norwood, James Maurice, 4214A.
Bounds, R. G., Jr., 4215A.
Stewart, James Clifton, 4216A.
Scruggs, Harold Woodrow, 4217A.
Carmichael, Walter Pendleton, Jr., 4218A.
Gerzln, Walter John, 4219A.
Newton, Preston Carnall, 4220A.
Herblin, William Leonard, 4221A.
Kemble, William Hudson, Jr., 4223A.
Sallsbury, Arthur George, 4224A.
Kuntz, Bernard Romaine, 4225A.
Haney, Otto Reed, 4226A.
Moore, Wilson, 4227A.
Kesling, Earl William, 4228A.
Foley, Jesse Rush, Jr., 4229A.
Irish, Lynn Thornton, 4231A.
Macdonald, Henry Gordon, 4232A.
Schofield, Martin Benjamin, Jr., 4233A.
Clark, Glen William, 4234A.
Calderbank, John Jacob Blrrell, 4236A.
Torresson, Thomas Samuel, Jr., 4237A.
Moir, Charles Louis, 4238A.
Silvey, Owen Watson, 4239A.
Chambers, Walter Earle, 4240A.
Herndon, Robert Elmore, Jr., 4241A.
Rector, Edward Franklin, 4242A.
Gilman, Mark Hulings, 4243A.
Hawel, Leo, Jr., 4244A.
Caple, Charles Edgar, Jr., 4245A.
Compton, Joe W., Jr., 4246A.
Ferguson, Matthew Henry Taylor, 4247A.
Byrnes, George Goodrich, Jr., 4248A.
Deryage, Minar Murry, 4249A.
Morris, William Wallace, Jr., 4250A.
Cumbaa, Noel Thomas, 4251A.
Berg, Gordon Howard, 4252A.
Bronson, Fred Ford, 4253A.
Livingston, John Waters, 4254A.
Fjelstad, Kenneth Silas, 4255A.
Taute, August Franklin, 4256A.
Calhoun, Robert Thomas, 4257A.
Lackey, Archer Evans, 4259A.
Ross, George Lee, 4262A.
Bigelow, Edgar Daugherty, 4263A.
Chapman, John Ward, 4264A.
Terry, Henry Warren, 3d, 4266A.
Jennings, Payne, Jr., 4267A.
Wys, Robert Andrew, 4268A.
West, Alden Edgar, 4269A.
Campbell, William Haddock, 4270A.
Pfingst, William Kingsley, 4271A.
Olson, Arvid Eldon, Jr., 4273A.
McKenna, Charles Francis, 3d, 4274A.
Lawson, Robert Morris, 4276A.
Flecke, Robert Hamilton, 4277A.
Stewart, John Elkin, 4278A.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the amendment to that amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] have been fully discussed by the Senate. I was wondering whether the Senate could now vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. In answer to the Senator from New Mexico, I believe there is no objection, although I suppose we should have a quorum call first. Certainly there is no objection to having a vote on the Lehman amendment at this time.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have no objection.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have prepared a statement on the Lehman amendment which I should like to insert in the RECORD at this time, preliminary to any voting. In line with the chairman's desire to reach an early vote I will withhold its delivery, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

I

Many moving words have been uttered about the Ferguson amendment crippling vital health activities. The air has been charged with emotion. I have been made to feel that I was a person who liked to go around setting fire to hospitals.

I think it is time that we get down to facts. It is time that we look at the Ferguson amendment in the light of the principle it represents, and in the light of what it actually does.

The pending amendment by the Senator from New York is to exempt seven of the appropriation items in this bill from the application of the Ferguson amendment. Let us first examine the functions in those items and just how the Ferguson amendment affects them.

A. The Lehman amendment would exempt hospitals and medical care from the application of the Ferguson amendment. They are already exempted by committee action.

B. Foreign Quarantine Service. The purposes of this appropriation are to (1) prevent the introduction into the United States of epidemic diseases from foreign countries; and (2) to provide medical services to the Department of State and to the Immigration and Naturalization Service in the examination of aliens.

There is nothing in this function which relates to the research or care of the ill about which some have spoken so movingly.

I call attention to the fact that the committee recommended an appropriation of \$2,868,029 with a limitation on personal services of \$2,507,458. My amendment would reduce both items by \$131,971 for an appropriation of \$2,736,058, of which \$2,375,487

would be for personal services. This proposed allowance for personal services is almost twice what the entire service received in 1942.

C. Operating expenses, National Institute of Health. This appropriation fosters and conducts medical and related research in a number of fields which have been the subject of moving pleas in the last few days. A schedule of its program, that is, its obligations by activities, is very revealing:

	1952 request	1950	1951 estimate
1. Grants to medical schools and other institutions and to individuals for research and training:			
(a) Research projects.....	\$9,000,000	\$5,417,342	\$7,501,000
(b) Fellowship projects.....	650,000	533,729	542,000
2. Direct operations:			
(a) Research.....	5,385,000	4,872,778	5,110,000
(b-1) Review and approval of research and training grants.....	555,000	543,422	523,900
(b-2) Administration.....	210,000	337,413	237,000
Total.....	15,800,000	11,704,684	13,913,000

The point at which those figures are revealing is reflected in two items in obligations by object:

	1952 request	1950	1951 estimate
Personal services.....	\$4,800,532	\$4,379,152	\$4,522,200
Grants, subsidies, and construction.....	9,650,000	5,951,071	8,043,000

The point is that this appropriation would make available \$9,650,000 for research and training grants, which is approximately \$3,700,000 more than was appropriated for those purposes in fiscal 1950, and not one cent of that grant money would be taken away by the Ferguson amendment.

Now I know that it will be pointed out that the \$4,800,532 requested for personal services includes a great deal of research under direct activities. It does, and some valuable new research is planned for next year. A gross amount of \$416,531 has been requested for 85 new positions in 1952, under the category of research.

I want to read the job descriptions of some of these new positions under research. The top six positions are for an institute director, clinical director, neurologist, executive officer, physiologist, and ophthalmologist. Now I want to read from the rest of the list:

Title	Grade	Number	Amount
RESEARCH			
Head, landscaping and garden section.....	GS-11.....	1	\$5,400
Organization and methods examiner.....	GS-11.....	1	6,200
Personnel representative.....	GS-11.....	3	16,200
Houskeeper.....	GS-10.....	1	5,000
Assistant engineer.....	GS-9.....	2	9,200
Dietitian.....	GS-9.....	1	4,600
Personnel representative.....	GS-9.....	2	9,200
Shop superintendent.....	GS-9.....	1	4,600
Administrative assistant.....	GS-8.....	1	4,200
Laboratory technician.....	GS-7.....	1	3,825
Secretary.....	GS-7.....	1	3,825
Do.....	GS-6.....	1	3,700
Mechanical engineer.....	GS-5.....	1	3,350
Secretary.....	GS-5.....	2	6,200
Clerk-dictating machine transcriber.....	GS-4.....	1	3,115
Clerk-stenographer.....	GS-4.....	1	2,875
Do.....	GS-3.....	2	5,300
Clerk-typist.....	GS-3.....	2	5,540

Title	Grade	Number	Amount
RESEARCH—con.			
Dictating machine transcriber.....	GS-3.....	2	\$5,620
Laundry superintendent.....	CPC-10.....	1	4,150
Foreman plumber.....	CPC-8.....	1	3,400
Head electrician.....	CPC-8.....	1	3,400
Head operating engineer.....	CPC-8.....	1	3,400
Electrician.....	CPC-6.....	1	2,900
Guard.....	CPC-4.....	4	9,800
Sheet-metal worker helper.....	CPC-4.....	1	2,450
Laborer.....	CPC-2.....	16	33,920

In all seriousness I ask whether or not we are adversely affecting the Nation's health by a 10-percent personnel cut-back which would eliminate some of those positions while preserving the values of pure researchers. Bear in mind that this amendment cuts about \$240,000 from what is provided in the bill for personal services, and that the gross of new positions asked for the National Health Institutes was \$416,531.

D. National Cancer Institute: This program has three major purposes: (1) To foster and conduct research in the causes of cancer and means for its detection, diagnosis, and treatment; (2) to improve the caliber of teaching in cancer problems and supply of trained personnel; (3) to assist in developing services at the local level.

Again the schedule of obligations by objects reveals the extent to which the scope of this work is affected by the Ferguson amendment:

	1952 request	1950	1951
Personal services.....	\$2,836,590	\$2,718,537	\$2,765,450
Grants, subsidies, contributions.....	10,315,000	15,836,367	10,217,000

In other words, about 3½ times as much is contained in this appropriation for research and other grants than for personal services in direct activities which include research. And not 1 cent of those research grants is touched by this amendment.

E. Mental health activities: This program has purposes, with respect to mental diseases and condition, which are identical with the purposes of the Cancer Institute in the field of cancer. Its program reflects primary emphasis upon grants as against direct activities, shown as follows:

	1952 request	1950	1951
Personal services.....	\$1,240,515	\$901,705	\$1,120,345
Grants, subsidies, contributions.....	8,182,000	8,140,806	5,561,000

Here, however, the ratio of research and similar grants is about 7 to 1 for personal services in direct activities. But again, the great bulk of this appropriation, for research and training, is not affected in any way by the Ferguson amendment.

F. Heart Institute: The institute's purposes follow those of cancer and mental health, with prime emphasis upon grants rather than direct research activities.

	1952 request	1950	1951 estimate
Personal services.....	\$1,540,351	\$1,014,901	\$1,533,981
Grants, subsidies, contributions.....	7,591,000	13,752,043	6,730,000

The ratio here is about 5 to 1, and I repeat that not 1 cent of the \$7,591,000 which makes up the bulk of the research and simi-

lar grants in this appropriation is touched by the Ferguson amendment.

G. Dental health activities: Again the program is similar to that in fields of cancer mental health and heart, except for a lesser emphasis on grants and stress instead of technical assistance to States, which is not classified as research. Obligations by activities indicate the nature of the program.

	1952 request	1950	1951
1. Grants to institutions and individuals:			
(a) Research projects.....	\$221,000	\$196,857	\$221,000
(b) Research fellowships.....	50,000	34,912	50,000
2. Direct operations:			
(a) Research.....	337,950	247,835	339,200
(b-1) Review and approval of grants.....	12,500	8,893	11,050
(b-2) Technical assistance to States.....	943,650	1,261,745	1,148,500
(b-3) Dental resources.....	125,000	70,479	125,000
(b-4) Administration.....	60,100	53,799	60,100
Total.....	1,750,000	1,874,520	1,954,850

Personal services amount to \$1,056,548 of the requested appropriation, and the Ferguson amendment would reduce the allowance for them by \$52,692, or about one-third of the amount budgeted for travel.

Mr. President, I have gone through each of these appropriation items in some detail because I think the record should be very clear as to whether or not my amendment has a crippling effect upon vital health activities. The evidence I have submitted should dispel any such notion for these reasons:

1. The first activity designated by the Lehman amendment for exception, that is, hospital and medical care, is already exempt from application of the Ferguson amendment.

2. Without discounting the importance of the Foreign Quarantine Service—although I think it can stand a cut just as can every other function of government—it is not in the category of health activities for which we have heard such moving pleas.

3. In the remaining items which the Lehman amendment proposes to exempt the great bulk of the appropriations are for research and other grants which make up the programs that are of most vital concern, and the Ferguson amendment does not touch them in any degree.

II

I should enter in the RECORD at this point a table showing exactly what the Ferguson amendment does do with respect to the seven items the Lehman amendment proposes to exempt. The reductions in each instance, of course, are for personal services:

	Committee recommendation	Ferguson amendment	Reduction
Hospital and medical care.....	\$30,200,000	\$30,200,000	-----
Foreign Quarantine Service.....	2,868,029	2,736,058	\$131,971
Health Institutes.....	15,559,973	15,319,946	240,027
Cancer Institute.....	19,805,171	19,663,342	141,829
Mental Health.....	10,737,974	10,675,948	62,026
Heart Institute.....	10,072,982	9,995,964	77,018
Dental Health.....	1,697,308	1,644,616	52,692
Total.....	90,941,437	90,235,874	705,563

¹ Exempt.

III

The Ferguson amendment reduces these items \$705,563. This compares to the total

effect of the Ferguson amendment upon the bill in an amount of about \$7,250,000.

IV

A further argument against the Lehman exemptions is the simple and positive fact that Congress has been far from niggardly with these agencies in the past. A series of 10-year tables showing the average number of employees and adjusted amounts available for each item in past fiscal years illustrate my point. I will place them in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

FOREIGN QUARANTINE SERVICE

Fiscal year	Average number of positions	Amount
1941.....	54	\$1,239,487
1942.....	478	1,251,416
1943.....	447	1,234,250
1944.....	439	1,325,534
1945.....	429	1,441,000
1946.....	483	1,806,700
1947.....	589	1,985,900
1948.....	613	2,450,000
1949.....	660	3,185,000
1950.....	665	3,141,000
1951.....	622	3,004,000
1952 estimate.....	608	3,000,000

NATIONAL HEALTH INSTITUTE

1941.....	402	\$525,893
1942.....	327	512,380
1943.....	633	2,017,406
1944.....	517	1,707,195
1945.....	511	1,795,608
1946.....	539	2,866,000
1947.....	803	5,966,948
1948.....	923	8,332,737
1949.....	1,232	14,540,000
1950.....	1,354	12,075,000
1951.....	1,409	13,913,900
1952, estimate.....	1,457	15,800,000

CANCER INSTITUTE

1944.....	132	\$530,000
1945.....	144	561,000
1946.....	122	548,700
1947.....	223	1,772,000
1948.....	429	14,500,000
1949.....	534	14,000,000
1950.....	672	18,900,000
1951.....	661	19,886,000
1952, estimate.....	663	19,947,000

MENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1941.....	483	\$1,438,500
1942.....	518	1,478,086
1943.....	599	1,344,280
1944 ¹	575	1,227,036
1945 ²	575	1,166,356
1946.....	703	1,413,897
1947.....	869	1,632,000
1948.....	977	4,250,000
1949.....	146	9,128,000
1950.....	188	11,612,000
1951.....	226	9,505,000
1952, estimate.....	247	10,800,000

HEART INSTITUTE

1948.....	60	\$1,632,479
1949.....	131	2,835,400
1950.....	248	10,675,000
1951.....	338	14,200,000
1952, estimate.....	331	10,150,000

DENTAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

1948.....	56	\$465,126
1949.....	208	1,733,202
1950.....	245	1,708,000
1951.....	235	1,954,850
1952 estimate.....	215	1,750,000

¹ Excludes \$8,000,000 contract authorization.

² Excludes \$6,000,000 contract authorization.

³ Activity included in "Hospitals and medical care."

⁴ Excludes \$2,300,000 contract authorization.

⁵ Excludes \$2,150,000 contract authorization.

⁶ Excludes \$5,350,000 contract authority.

The significance of these tables is that they show appropriations for these 6 activities to have increased \$55,565,515, or about 950 percent, and personnel to have increased by 2,334, or about 200 percent since 1941, or whatever later year the particular program was innovated. Yesterday, at page 6509 of the RECORD, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] introduced data showing appropriations for the Public Health Service at large had increased tenfold in the past 10 years, and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] reminded us that amounts in the pending bill are 32½ percent above 1951 expenditures. That is scarcely a record of congressional niggardliness.

V

Another argument has been made against this amendment, that it will actually effect a greater reduction than 10 percent from budget estimates for personnel services because it will require lay-offs and the payment of terminal leave.

To contradict that argument, as well as to demonstrate the absolute essentiality of this amendment, I wish to refer to a table showing employment and payroll records for the agencies which are covered by this bill. It appears at page 6454 of the RECORD for June 8.

Mr. President, that table reveals these startling facts:

1. Since the first of the present fiscal year employment in these agencies has been increasing at a rate of 450 per month, from 43,166 on July 1, 1950, to 47,643 on May 1, 1951.

2. Payrolls have increased from \$12,466,000 monthly to \$14,681,000, an annual rate of \$176,000,000, which is about \$16,500,000 above the rate of last July.

3. If the President's budget requests are granted, employment in the agencies covered in this bill would rise to about 49,000, which is 6,000 or about 14 percent above the figure at the start of this year.

This data confirms the whole trend of Government-wide employment. Since last July Government has been adding to its rolls at a rate of about 44,000 per month. The Bureau of the Budget reports 1952 appropriation requests contemplate a projection of that trend for the whole of the coming year, or a total of some 400,000 new employees. Mr. President, if we cut 10 percent from budget estimates for 1952 employment, which is the end purpose of my amendment, we will not even be holding our own in the fight to reduce Government payrolls.

Not only are tax dollars involved. Every person added to Government payrolls is one less person available for production enterprise. What we forget is that Government is not productive. In general, Government employment adds absolutely nothing to the gross national product. When production is not only our great bulwark against inflation but in a race even for survival.

The President has recognized this in a letter directing all Government agencies to survey their personnel needs in the direction of conserving manpower. I place his letter of last Saturday in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

"The present emergency has caused great demands on the manpower resources of our country, with shortages of manpower in certain special areas already being felt.

"It is extremely important that all possible steps be taken to eliminate these shortages and to assure the availability of manpower for all essential mobilization activities.

"Adequate solution to our manpower problems will require the exercise of energy, imagination, and ingenuity on the part of every employer and employee.

"AN OBJECTIVE FOR ALL AGENCIES

"The Federal Government, as the largest single employer in the country, should set

the example in accomplishing this objective. Therefore, I expect the head of each executive department and agency to take all necessary actions to conserve manpower and generally to bring about maximum effectiveness and economy in the utilization of personnel.

"This manpower conservation program should be given top priority throughout the executive branch.

"In order to assist the departments and agencies in achieving the results I desire, I want you, together with the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, to issue instructions on steps which can be taken to conserve manpower, and to advise and consult with the departments and agencies on specific problems which they may have in carrying out this program.

"REPORTS OF ROSTERS ASKED

"I am also asking that the Bureau of the Budget and the Civil Service Commission request reports from all departments and agencies and conduct regular inspections and surveys so that reports can be made to me on progress in conserving manpower, including recommendations for further actions which may be necessary.

"This program to achieve conservation and utilization of manpower in the Federal Government is endorsed by the Manpower Policy Committee of the Office of Defense Mobilization, and is in line with its over-all program for conserving manpower throughout the country.

"I am sending a similar letter to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission."

Mr. President, we are not just proposing to cut something like \$11,700,000 out of the budget requests and \$7,250,000 off the bill in its present form. We are seeking to stem a tide which will one day engulf us if we do not vote for the principle which my amendment provides.

It is a principle which can tolerate no breaches, no matter what impassioned pleas are made for exceptions: today for health activities, tomorrow for something else and do on until we have rendered this important principle helpless. Of course, these activities are worthy, or presumably they would never have been authorized. But the same can be said of every other function of government.

Mr. President, this is a principle which calls for every Member of the Senate to stand and be counted. Do we believe in economy or is the answer yes—but? That is the question which is now before us.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask the same privilege. I have a memorandum which shows the exact character of the work which would be affected by the Ferguson amendment if my amendment were not agreed to. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

I would like to point out the kind of research work of the National Institutes of Health which will be directly affected by the Ferguson amendment. An additional 5 percent cut would curtail or perhaps eliminate the total effectiveness of such studies as these—not necessarily by cutting the senior scientist himself but certainly by taking away the junior scientist and technicians upon whom so much of his work depends.

1. Cancer: Important work now being performed with large cultures of living cancer cells permitting improved observation of cancer growth and improved methods of measuring growth rates.

2. Cancer: The laboratory which has made an important contribution to the hormonal treatment of prostatic cancer. More im-

portant, this study holds promise of finding some method for the early diagnosis of this killer.

3. Heart: The unit which is perfecting a diagnostic instrument, the electrokymograph, for the early detection of heart disease. This mechanism is just at the evaluative stage and demands a wide range of clinical and experimental use.

4. Mental health research at Lexington, Ky., in the whole field of drug addiction and the development of suitable morphine substitutes: These studies, as you know from recent public reports, are of immediate urgency to the people of this country and particularly important now that we know the extent to which the youth of our country is becoming addicted to drugs.

5. Dental field: The studies of how fluorine prevents dental caries and how it is possible to use fluorine to achieve maximum control of tooth decay without injuring the body. These studies are the much needed follow-up on the recent finding concerning the beneficial effects of public water fluoridation.

6. Studies on the emergency use of salt and soda solutions for the treatment of shock due to burn or other severe injuries: The importance of these studies to our civil defense program is, I know, apparent to all of us. The salt-soda solution is no substitute for blood plasma or whole blood, but it is the best emergency treatment available in the event of large-scale catastrophe in which medical treatment might not be available for up to 72 hours.

7. Programs such as the development of new vaccines to prevent epidemic and the control of all biological products—serums, vaccines, and antibiotics—upon whose potency and purity so much of our medical strength depends: These same people are also responsible for the safety and purity of the blood banks which have direct application to both civilian and military medicine.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Green	McMahon
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Benton	Hendrickson	Moody
Brewster	Hennings	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Pastore
Byrd	Ives	Robertson
Cain	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Connally	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Knowland	Sparkman
Duff	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Taft
Eastland	Long	Thye
Ecton	Magnuson	Underwood
Ellender	Malone	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Welker
Flanders	McCarran	Wherry
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
George	McFarland	
Gillette	McKellar	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed

a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on this question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the amendment proposed by Mr. FERGUSON, for himself and other Senators, it is proposed to change the period to a colon and add the following: "Provided, That this section shall not apply to appropriations of the Public Health Service for hospitals and medical care, foreign quarantine service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, mental health activities, National Heart Institute, and dental health activities."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to address a question to the Senator from Oregon or to the Senator from New Mexico, who has been handling this bill, but I see that neither of them is on the floor at this time. Under the circumstances, I should like to request leave to address my question to the Senator from New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator may do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator from New York that he refer to page 23 of the committee report, in order to be able to reply to the question which I wish to ask him. From examining the portion of page 23 of the report which covers the seven activities referred to in the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, I note that in the first instance no change was

made either by the House of Representatives or by the Senate committee in the budget recommendations for hospitals and medical care, which was the first of the seven activities. In other words, the so-called Cordon amendment, which was applied by the committee to the other six activities, was not applied to that particular activity. Does the Senator from New York know why the Cordon amendment was not applied to that particular large activity?

Mr. LEHMAN. No. I shall have to defer to the chairman of the subcommittee, inasmuch as I am not a member of the committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I see that the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] has now returned to the floor, and I should like to address my question to him. I wish to ask him to examine page 23 of the committee report, with particular reference to the seven items listed together on that page, which are mentioned in the amendment of the distinguished Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I note in the first instance that the amount recommended by the budget for hospitals and medical care, which is the first of the seven items—that amount being \$30,200,000—is not changed in the bill as passed by the House, and is not changed in the bill as reported by the Senate committee, and therefore was not subjected to the so-called Cordon amendment, which was applied by the committee to the other six items. Will the Senator state for the RECORD the reason why the so-called Cordon amendment was not applied to that item?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, I shall try to state the reason. The subcommittee did not take any action on the so-called Cordon amendment, which was submitted to the full committee. The decision and conclusion reached on the Cordon amendment were reached by the full committee.

In approving the proposal of the Senator from Oregon for a cut of 5 percent on each appropriation, the committee directed that the cut and the limitation on personal services should not apply to Freedmen's Hospital or to any other hospital. That amendment would not apply to any hospital, whether it be Freedmen's Hospital or any hospital. That amendment would not apply to any hospital, whether it be Freedmen's Hospital or any hospital under the Public Health Service. That is why the Cordon amendment is applied in that way. The committee did not want it to affect hospitals or to apply to personnel having to do with hospital operations.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. Is the Senate to understand, then, that the Cordon amendment making a 5 percent cut in appropriations for personnel was applied to the other six items covered by the Lehman amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct, but only insofar as it affects administrative operations. The amendment applies to all six of the others, but the idea was to exempt hospital operations from the Cordon amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I should like to ask a further question: I note from the last column in the tabulation affecting these particular activities that the Senate committee did not decrease these particular items as they appeared in the House bill,

except as to the foreign quarantine service, and that it increased all of the five last-named items, so as to make a total increase of these six items of about \$1,000,000 above the House bill, is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. Then, even after the application of the Cordon amendment to all the activities which are in the so-called Lehman amendment, there is still an increase of about \$1,000,000 in the Senate bill as to these particular items, compared with the House bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me give the Senator a breakdown. The National Institute of Health item is increased by \$59,973; National Cancer Institute, increased by \$305,171; mental health activities, an increase of \$437,974; National Heart Institute, an increase of \$72,982, and dental health activities, an increase of \$197,308, or in round figures, an increase of approximately \$1,000,000 over the House figures.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a portion of page 23 of the committee's report which deals with the seven activities listed in the amendment of the Senator from New York, namely, hospitals and medical care, foreign quarantine service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, mental health activities, National Heart Institute, and dental health activities, with the extensions contained in the eight columns opposite each of those listings.

There being no objection, the portion of the table referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214 (general reduction of \$550,000,000 in General Appropriation Act, 1951) estimate for 1952, and amounts recommended in the bill for 1952

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Agency and item	Appropriations, 1951		Estimates, 1952	Recommended in House bill for 1952	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (—), Senate bill compared with—		
	Specific amounts	As reduced under sec. 1214				1951 appropriations as reduced under sec. 1214	Budget estimates, 1952	House bill
Hospitals and medical care.....	\$29,050,000	\$29,024,000	\$30,200,000	\$30,200,000	\$30,200,000	+\$1,176,000	-----	-----
Foreign quarantine service.....	3,104,000	3,004,000	3,000,000	2,990,000	2,868,029	—135,971	—\$131,971	—\$121,971
National Institutes of Health.....	15,350,000	13,913,900	15,800,000	15,500,000	15,559,973	+1,646,073	—240,027	+59,973
National Cancer Institute.....	20,486,000	19,886,000	19,947,000	19,500,000	19,805,171	—80,829	—141,829	+305,171
Mental health activities.....	10,000,000	9,505,000	10,800,000	10,300,000	10,737,974	+1,232,974	—62,026	+437,974
National Heart Institute.....	15,104,400	14,554,400	10,150,000	10,000,000	10,072,982	—4,481,418	—77,018	+72,982
Dental health activities.....	2,090,000	1,954,850	1,750,000	1,500,000	1,697,308	—257,542	—52,692	+197,308

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to point out to the Senator from Florida that, although hospitals and medical care are included in my amendment, it was unnecessary, because they are excluded, also, by the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. Computing dollar-wise exactly what the distinguished Senator from Florida has told the Sen-

ate, and also having noted the placing of this exhibit in the RECORD, it brings up this question: Dollar-wise, in my opinion, the Cordon amendment would stop an increase, but there would be no saving dollar-wise, it seems to me. As I figure it, as a member of the committee, even with the adoption of the Cordon amendment, we would not quite hold our own so far as an increase is concerned; so, dollar-wise, it requires the Ferguson amendment in order to make any cut in the personnel now employed by those departments.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. President, the observation I was going to make was this, that I should

like very much to support the Ferguson amendment, if it does not apply to hospitals and medical care. The copy of the amendment which is on my desk does not show that hospitals and medical care are eliminated from the operation of the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we examine the bill and also examine the amendment, it will be found that hospitals and medical care are excluded from the Ferguson amendment. There can be no doubt about it. The Cordon amendment excluded them, and the Ferguson amend-

ment only extends the Cordon amendment from 5 percent to 10 percent; so that they are excluded, as the Senator from New York has now indicated that he believes them to be. There is no doubt about the fact that they are excluded. They are excluded because my amendment takes effect only wherever amounts for personal services are specified in the bill, and the bill does not specify any amounts for personal services in the item for hospitals and medical care.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Michigan. With the explicit understanding that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan does not apply to hospitals and medical care, which is by far the largest item in this list covered by the Lehman amendment, and which is in the sum of \$30,200,000, and because of the fact that the committee report, even with the application of the Cordon amendment, shows an increase over the House bill of about \$1,000,000 in the other six items, I expect to oppose the Lehman amendment and to support the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad the Senator raised that point on the floor.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. CHAVEZ. In order to have the correct figure in the RECORD, the increase made by the committee over the House figures is \$1,096,379.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I appreciate that the Senate is anxious to vote and to make progress in the consideration of this bill. I shall not take very much time, but, in view of the fact that I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and further in view of the fact that I intend to support the Ferguson amendment, I feel that I should make some statement or comment regarding my position.

First, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made last Friday by the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee [Mr. McKELLAR]. I echo those sentiments, and especially do I want to join in the sentiments he expressed regarding the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ] who reported this bill. I also wish to commend the chairman and the members of the subcommittee for having done an unprecedented thing, so far as I know, and for the time I have been in the Senate; that is, the Senate committee reduced the appropriations as passed by the House of Representatives. The chairman and each member of that subcommittee are to be commended. They have certainly taken a step in the right direction, and it is a long step. The only thing we are now undertaking to do is to examine that step and to measure it against conditions we face today, with the idea that we may be able to stretch it a little further in the direction of preserving the solvency of this Nation.

Mr. President, notwithstanding the reduction of more than \$200,000,000 which has been made in this bill in the budget estimates and the reduction of more than \$100,000,000 in the figures of the House bill, I wish to call attention to the facts with reference to appropriations for the Public Health Service. Last year, in fiscal 1951, it had total appropriations of \$274,000,000-plus. The bill as reported by the subcommittee—and I think possibly as reported by the full committee has made a slight reduction—but, as reported by the subcommittee, this bill provided \$361,000,000-plus for these services for fiscal 1952. In other words, even in the stress of our economic situation and in our desire to reduce over-all expenditures to the minimum, there is an increase in this bill for the Public Health Service of 32½ percent over and above 1951 appropriations. I mention that merely to show that we are not here trying to cripple an essential service of the Government, and that it is being supported up to the standard to which it is accustomed. We are even making appropriations beyond that. By this amendment we are merely undertaking to reduce personnel, and thus to effectuate such savings as will be brought about as the result of this reduction in personnel.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield first to the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question. While the committee reduced the bill below the budget estimates, is it not true that it is above the appropriations of last year by \$91,146,767? What I complain of is that we are not at all reducing the appropriation in this bill below last year's appropriation, but are increasing it by \$91,146,767. Is not that true?

Mr. McCLELLAN. The able chairman of the committee is correct as to the figures he has quoted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There was a sound reason for that, at least, so far as the subcommittee and the full committee were concerned. If the Senator will turn to page 3 of the report, he will note that the report calls attention to that increase, \$91,146,767. It is a substantial increase over the 1951 appropriation, and it results from what? Partially from the abandonment of making contracts. Heretofore, when we did not appropriate the money, we did authorize agencies to enter into contracts. The committee decided that that was not a sound way to operate the Government. Instead of giving them contract authority to enter into contractual obligations of \$200,000,000, we increased the appropriation by \$91,000,000, in round figures.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think that is absolutely correct, Mr. President. There is no criticism on my part as to the amount of the appropriation. I simply made

these comparisons to illustrate and to point out that we are not trying to cripple these services. We are trying to carry them on as essential services and to provide for them on the same basis and on the same standard on which they have been operating in the past. Without trying to cripple the services, can we not make a reduction in personnel to the extent of 10 percent? That is all we are trying to do. That means that from a practical standpoint 9 employees, in this period of crisis, undertake to do what 10 employees did heretofore. It does not work out on exactly that basis, of course, but substantially, in the over-all picture, that will be the effect of it.

As I said yesterday, Mr. President, and I am very sincere about this, when we are calling upon the young manhood of our Nation to make sacrifices for our freedom and for the defense of our country, is it asking too much in this time of economic crisis as well as of other crises in our Government, for ourselves and for other employees of the Government, whether in the legislative branch or the executive branch, to work a little harder and a little longer to get the job done as our contribution and sacrifice in the great effort we are making to defend the free world? I do not think so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Arkansas has stated the issue correctly. The committee, through the Cordon amendment, recommended to this body that personnel be cut by 5 percent. Under the Ferguson amendment, it would be decreased 10 percent. So the issue is a simple one. The subcommittee and the committee, in recommending a cut of 5 percent, thought that that was proper and would be as far as we could go without crippling some essential functions of government. But the Senator from New Mexico, in handling the bill and in announcing the issues, would be willing to vote now. If the Senate thinks we have not done enough, let us go to 10 percent. But let us vote.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am willing to hasten the vote, but I did want to state my position.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan thinks that one thing should be made clear, and that is that this is only a 10-percent reduction from the budget figure for 1952. That figure adds many employees who were not on the rolls this last year. This particular bill is tied to budget requests for an average employment of 48,964 persons.

In all the categories covered by the bill there have been added about 450 jobs a month in the past year, and the increase will continue in the next year. So that a cut of 10 percent will really leave them with about what they have this year, but will not add what the budget proposes for next year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It will operate in just about that manner. At least, 1 out

of every 10 persons will not be dismissed from the service. It simply means 1 out of 10 less than what has been requested for next year's operation, for which there was anticipated an increase in personnel. That is all we are doing.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, if we are sincere when we talk economy, if we mean to do anything about it, we should start with this first appropriation bill and lay a pattern and set an example, fix our goal, drive to it, and go through with it. We talk a great deal about economy. I talk a great deal about it in public addresses and in private conversations with my constituents. We are always talking economy. We make speeches about it, and then we say, "But—"

Mr. President, the time has come to eliminate the "but" and to do the job of reducing expenditures. I am willing to bear my share of it. I am quite conscious of the fact that reducing expenditures and practicing economy are not always popular politically; certainly not, with some groups. But, Mr. President, it has now become the solemn duty of the Congress, under its obligation to this Nation and to its people, to those who are making the sacrifices of life and blood in the defense of freedom, for us to do a job on the home front toward preserving the solvency of the Nation which our Armed Forces fight to defend.

Mr. President, as I said yesterday, as I vote for this amendment, I expect to vote for provisions in the legislative appropriation bill which will have substantially the same effect, because I believe we should make sacrifices in this body just as we call upon the executive branch to make sacrifices.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to address a question to the Senator from Arkansas based upon the fact that at least one, and perhaps other specific reductions, have already been made by the adoption of amendments addressed to special parts of the bill. I refer particularly to the reduction made by the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois on last Friday. It is the understanding of the Senator from Florida that notwithstanding the application of such specific reductions, either made heretofore, by action of the Senate, or to be made hereafter, the meaning of the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan is such that it of itself, in conjunction with the so-called Cordon amendment written into the bill by the committee, will not operate to reduce more than 10 percent the appropriation or that portion thereof which is designed to pay the salaries of personnel. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. It cannot exceed 10 percent. In fact, it will amount to less than that. Bear in mind that the percentage of decrease is geared to the budget and not to appropriations.

Mr. HOLLAND. The question as to which I wanted to be sure my understanding is correct is this: Notwith-

standing the adoption of specific amendments, the meaning of the Ferguson amendment by itself, when added to the effect of the Cordon amendment, is that it can never operate to reduce more than 10 percent the appropriations for salaries of personnel.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It cannot possibly operate to exceed that.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] quoted some figures a few minutes ago relative to the increase in personnel as provided in the bill. On pages 805 and 806 of the Senate subcommittee hearings there appears a compilation of personnel. The compilation does not include personnel employed with reference to certain trust funds. The reason those trust funds are not included is because the personnel employed for the administration of the trust funds is not paid by the taxpayers. That personnel is paid by the trust fund itself, from special taxes on the employer and the employees. There has been an increase in these employees for the trust funds because of the amendments adopted some months ago to the Social Security Act. But the pay of such employees does not in any way constitute a burden upon the general taxpayers of the United States.

According to the table, if we pass this bill without the Cordon amendment, which proposes a 5-percent reduction in appropriations for personnel, there would be an increase of only 136 employees. But the Senate has already agreed to the Cordon amendment reducing by 5 percent the appropriations personnel, so, of course, it will follow logically that we have already acted to decrease personnel this year as compared to the number of personnel last year.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I wish to give some figures and to indicate just what will be the final result if this formula of cutting these appropriations is applied. It is anticipated by the Bureau of the Budget that the funds it has requested for all departments will provide for 2,600,000 to 2,700,000 employees of the Federal Government during the next fiscal year. The total amount requested in the budget for all personal services—salaries—of employees of the Government is \$16,865,000,000.

Assuming the formula provided by the Ferguson amendment is applied to all appropriation bills as affecting personnel, and assuming that it will operate to limit personnel to 90 percent, and not above that, we will actually effectuate savings under the budget of only \$1,666,500,000. That is all we are going to save, even if the formula carried all the way through all the appropriations. That is the maximum that can be saved by this amendment. But, Mr. President, with a \$71,000,000,000 budget, and that constantly increasing—there is no doubt about the fact that supplemental requests will be coming to Congress—if we are going to reduce domestic expenditures in any substantial amount we will have to employ some process such as this to do it. Even after making this

reduction, if we reach a cut in the budget of some four or five or six or seven billion dollars, as some of us had hoped we might by practicing economy, we have still got to go much further than this in reducing individual items of appropriation. That, Mr. President, is the task that confronts us.

I will say in conclusion that I have stated in public addresses that the Federal Government in this period, when it is demanding sacrifices by its citizens, should be willing to set the same standard of sacrifices in Government spending that it calls on the citizens to make in their standard of living. We can economize if we will. If, however, we are unwilling to economize in Government, I doubt that we have a moral right to take more of the people's earnings away from them in taxation to support an extravagant government.

Mr. President, I shall vote for economy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators.

(Mr. LEHMAN's amendment is as follows:)

At the end of the amendment, change the period to a colon and add the following language: "Provided, That this section shall not apply to appropriations of the Public Health Service for hospitals and medical care, foreign quarantine service, National Institutes of Health, National Cancer Institute, mental health activities, National Heart Institute, and dental health activities."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "yea," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the

Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] who is absent on official business is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "yea."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who is necessarily absent is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] who is detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] who is absent because of illness is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Montana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] who is absent on official business. If present and voting the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—38

Aiken	Johnson, Tex.	Moody
Benton	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Chavez	Kefauver	Neely
Clements	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Kilgore	Pastore
Ellender	Langer	Russell
Gillette	Lehman	Saltonstall
Green	Long	Smathers
Hayden	Magnuson	Sparkman
Hennings	Maybank	Stennis
Hill	McFarland	Thye
Ives	McMahon	Underwood
Johnson, Colo.	Monroney	

NAYS—42

Bennett	Ferguson	McClellan
Brewster	Flanders	McKellar
Bricker	Frear	Mundt
Bridges	Fulbright	Robertson
Butler, Md.	George	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Hoy	Smith, N. C.
Carlson	Holland	Taft
Cordon	Jenner	Watkins
Dirksen	Knowland	Welker
Douglas	Malone	Wherry
Dworshak	McCarran	Williams
Ecton	McCarthy	Young

NOT VOTING—16

Anderson	Hunt	Nixon
Capehart	Kem	O'Connor
Case	Lodge	Tobey
Connally	Martin	Wiley
Duff	Millikin	
Humphrey	Murray	

So. Mr. LEHMAN's amendment to Mr. FERGUSON's amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment designated "6-11-51-A" and ask that it be read. I offer the amendment, and I wish to make a comment upon it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there not an amendment now pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan is pending.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understood the Senator from Illinois to offer an amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, which is in order.

The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON for himself and other Senators it is proposed on line 8, to strike out the period, and insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That such reductions shall not apply to the Bureau of Apprenticeship, the Bureau of Employment Security, the Revision of the Consumers' Price Index, the Public Health Service amounts for assistance to States, General and Hospital Construction Services, and the Bureau of Public Assistance."

On page 4, line 5, strike out "\$2,578,-682" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,423,-000."

On page 4, line 6, strike out "\$2,153,-049" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,039,-731."

On page 4, line 20, strike out "\$5,245,-959" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,635,-500."

On page 4, lines 20 and 21, strike out "\$1,513,765" and insert in lieu thereof "\$743,500."

On page 4, line 23, strike out "\$4,351,-773" and insert in lieu thereof "\$4,122,-733."

On page 9, line 16, strike out "\$1,125,-000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,-000", and strike out "\$991,323" and insert in lieu thereof "\$939,143."

On page 21, line 2, strike out "\$15,960,-000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,000,-000."

On page 21, line 3, strike out "\$1,900,-944" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,800,-895."

On page 23, line 19, strike out "\$1,166,-465" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,100,-000", and strike out "\$1,017,165" and insert in lieu thereof "\$963,630."

On page 31, line 5, strike out "\$1,600,-000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,463,-400", and strike out "\$1,455,400" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,378,800."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Illinois that in his opinion the part of the Senator's amendment which is an amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is in order, and that the part of the

amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois which amends the text of the bill itself and has no relationship to the Ferguson amendment is not in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I be permitted to discuss the substantive matter of my amendment and also comment on the ruling of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to proceed.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Chair interpret his ruling as to which part of the Senator's amendment is in order and which part is not in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished occupant of the chair to interpret what he has said. If I understand correctly, the Chair has ruled that the portion of the amendment embraced in lines 1 to 7 on page 1 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would be in order. I further understand that lines 8 and 9 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would not be in order, because those lines are in the nature of an amendment to the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is the understanding of the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe it is important to bring out that fact. I thank the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The cuts which I propose are deeper than those proposed by the Ferguson amendment. My purpose is not to exempt from cuts any amounts which would be reduced by the Ferguson amendment.

The first paragraph of my amendment merely exempts certain items from the Ferguson amendment in order that the subsequent paragraphs may cut more deeply than the Ferguson amendment cuts. Therefore it is a proposal not to save the budget from the cuts made by the Ferguson amendment, but to save more money for the taxpayers of America.

Mr. President, I should have much preferred not to have had the Ferguson amendment before the Senate at this time. I had hoped that we would be able to proceed item by item. I had hoped that in some cases no cuts would be made, in other cases cuts much greater than a 10-percent reduction in personal services could be made, and that in still other cases cuts of less than 10 percent could be made. In short, I had hoped that we could proceed item by item and use a surgeon's knife rather than make a uniform 10-percent reduction in personal services across the board, as would be the effect of the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to complete my statement before yielding. I had hoped, therefore, that we would be able to submit amendments item by item. However, the Senator from Michigan was recognized, and the parliamentary situation is that his amendment is now being considered by the Senate. I shall vote for it. It is a poor way of doing a

necessary job. I shall vote for it reluctantly. I can understand the motives of Senators who will vote against it.

From a parliamentary point of view we seem to be estopped at the moment from offering amendments which would provide for cuts being made on the items affected by the Ferguson amendment, and the Ferguson amendment affects virtually every item which contains any amount for salaries. Under the ruling of the Chair, if it is upheld, we are estopped from offering additional amendments to such items while the Ferguson amendment is pending. Then, once the Ferguson amendment is agreed to, the Senate Parliamentarian tells me that the parliamentary situation would be such that further reductions could not be made on items affected by the Ferguson amendment, which include practically every item containing funds for salaries. Therefore I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if, in the first place, he will accept the additional reductions which I am proposing. If he will, I shall ask that unanimous consent be given to him to incorporate such further reductions in his amendment.

I may say that the additional reductions which I am proposing total approximately \$1,420,000, and cover items which would have been otherwise covered in my amendments lettered "C," "D," "F," "L," "N," and "R." In the Bureau of Apprenticeship I am proposing an additional cut of \$32,364. In the Bureau of Employment Security I am proposing an additional cut of \$381,419. The reason for the added cut in the Bureau of Employment Security is a reduction in the veterans' reemployment services. The war has been over for almost 6 years. During the intervening 6 years the emergency problem of veterans in obtaining reemployment would seem to have been taken care of. By this time they should have been assimilated in the civilian population, and should be more or less taken care of as other persons are, without greatly added special privileges.

I am not proposing to sweep away entirely the veterans' reemployment program. I am proposing, in view of the fact that certainly the acuteness of their reemployment problem has been diminished, that we make an additional cut of approximately \$380,000 in the service. It would seem particularly desirable to do so in view of the fact that we now have relatively full employment and unemployment has fallen off, I believe, to an extremely low figure of about 1,600,000.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I gladly yield.

Mr. KILGORE. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that the first paragraph of his amendment, which I would be inclined to support very strongly, puts those of us who would like to support the amendment in a very dangerous situation because of what is contained in the other portion of the amendment. It is somewhat like teaming a sheep with a goat. There are perhaps many Senators who would like to support the first paragraph of the amendment. I know that I personally

would be glad to support it. I ask if the Senator would consent to divide the amendment into two parts so that we could vote on it separately. In that case it would be a very simple matter for the Senator from West Virginia to know exactly how he should vote. The first paragraph of the Senator's amendment is highly meritorious. However, I cannot accept the whole amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like very much to oblige my good friend from West Virginia, but I cannot do what he suggests. Were I to do so I would exempt the six items from any cuts whatever. They would be exempt not only from the added cuts which I propose to make, but also from the cuts proposed by the Ferguson amendment. I made the exemptions in the first paragraph only to be able to clear the way for greater cuts contained in the subsequent paragraphs.

If it is the ruling of the Chair that the latter sections of the amendment are not in order, I shall appeal to the Senator from Michigan and to the other Members of the body, under unanimous-consent procedure to incorporate the cuts into the Ferguson amendment.

If I may continue, I propose to cut the revision of the Consumers' Price Index by another \$72,825, down to a total of \$1,000,000. Before I came to this body I believe I was the largest private consumer of statistics of the Department of Labor. I have a very high opinion of the excellence of their work. Nevertheless, there is waste in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, as there is in other bureaus. A subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, under the able chairmanship of Representative WILLIAMS of Mississippi, submitted a very caustic report on waste in the compilation of the Consumers' Price Index.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. FLANDERS. Would not the appropriation for the revision of the Consumers' Price Index be a one-time appropriation? Am I wrong in understanding that it would not be a continuing appropriation, but would be the last appropriation to be made?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe this is supposed to be the last one.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is a question of revising the Consumer Price Index; and when it is revised, that appropriation will not again be required. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The appropriation of an added \$1,000,000 will give the Bureau a total of \$4,000,000 which it can use for the index.

Mr. FLANDERS. Is the Senator from Illinois, who says he is the largest consumer—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I said I am the largest private consumer of these statistics.

Mr. FLANDERS. Yes, I understand him to say that he is the largest private consumer of the work of the Consumers' Price Index. Is he sure that with the elimination of \$250,000,000, the price index can be completed this year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No one can be certain of that. I simply wish to point out that a subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has said that the compilation of this index has been accompanied by excessive waste, that a large staff was assembled in the Washington office before any results began to flow in from the field, and that many complaints went to Representative WILLIAMS and his colleagues in regard to large numbers of clerks in the Bureau of Labor Statistics who were idle, who were doing no work whatsoever.

Mr. FLANDERS. It is known that at the present time, when the bureau is in the process of finishing its work on this project, that condition still exists?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, that is not known. That condition existed as of December 5 of last year, however.

Mr. FLANDERS. It seems to me that in view of the use which is made of these statistics, particularly by management and labor, it is of extreme importance that we be sure that the work on the index will be finished during the coming fiscal year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope it will be, but I think a great deal can be done with a million dollars. It seems to me that amount is sufficient, and that there is no justification for assuming that this agency requires an additional quarter-million or an additional eighth-million dollars.

Mr. FLANDERS. Does the Senator from Illinois agree with me that it is important that the index be completed this year?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, particularly in connection with price adjustments and wage adjustments, in order that we may know how much prices have increased.

Mr. FLANDERS. If the Bureau of Labor Statistics is able to show due diligence and proper efficiency in the completion of its statistical work, but also is able to show that it is unable to finish the work, would not it be in order for the Bureau to present evidence to that effect to the Appropriations Committee and to request another appropriation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Bureau could always request a deficiency appropriation; but this amendment would put the Bureau on its guard, in a sense, for by means of this amendment we would be notifying that agency that in view of the report of Representative WILLIAMS and his subcommittee—and I do not know that the accuracy of his report has been challenged—we are reluctant to entrust the Bureau with the full amount of money requested.

I read now from the report of the subcommittee headed by Representative WILLIAMS:

The subcommittee finds that a substantial part of the \$1,000,000 initially appropriated for the revision of the Consumer Price Index by this Division was dissipated through gross overstaffing, inferior planning, untrained supervision, and improvident administration.

The subcommittee believes that the supervision prevalent in this Division has been inept, poorly qualified, and without the proper concept of the taxpayers' interest in the responsibility it has assumed.

That is House Report No. 2457, part II, Eighty-first Congress, second session, page 55.

Mr. FLANDERS. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that I merely wish to make sure that he agrees with me in my belief that this index must be completed this year. I agree with the Senator in hoping that the action which he proposes will encourage the Bureau to exercise due diligence and efficiency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Vermont very much.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will not the reduction the Senator from Illinois proposes—namely, a reduction of virtually 20 percent in the budget estimate for the Bureau of Labor Statistics—tend to eliminate the use of figures relative to the small towns and medium-size towns in the preparation of the cost-of-living index, on which so much depends in connection with wage control, price control, and so forth?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think it would. I believe it should lead to greater efficiency in the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This Bureau happens to be my pet bureau; but I have read from the Williams report—and it is not challenged—and I must say that it indicates to me that the Bureau could improve in efficiency and could save money.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree with the Senator from Illinois that we can no longer tolerate waste, for we cannot afford it, and we should not countenance it.

However, I wonder whether a 20-percent cut should be made in the budget estimate for this Bureau. By making a 10-percent cut we could at least get rid of the fat, of the excess staff. Such a cut, if made, would permit the work to go on in a proper way year after year, and that is most necessary if we are to have a proper picture of the economic condition and if we are to be able to utilize the basic economic indices, which I think our country uses more than does any other country.

Therefore, I hate to see the figures for the small towns and the middle-size towns dropped from the price index. My understanding is that figures for only two towns between the Mississippi River and the California coast line will be used in any way in connection with the new index if this cut is made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What the Senator from Oklahoma has just said indicates the position into which the administrators always attempt to put Congress. When we propose a cut, the administrators say, "It will mean a reduction of the service." They never admit the possibility of a reduction in waste and an increase in efficiency.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I compliment the Senator from Illinois on his efforts, in connection with this measure, to make every possible saving

which can be made and to eliminate inefficiency, but I wonder whether by this means we would do harm, which would be a great deal more costly, if this index were not allowed to reflect properly the rises in the cost of living and other matters which are so valuable in connection with the middle-size towns and the States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to page 258 of the committee hearings. At that point in the hearings he will see a list of items included in the consumer price index, and it will give him a view of how the index affects the entire country.

Although I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that we should compliment the Senator from Illinois on his efforts to eliminate all waste, certainly we cannot say that it is proper economy to do away with the price index, which affects so many millions of people in the United States. On page 258 of the committee hearings there are set forth the various items which affect the everyday life of the American people, whether they live in the District of Columbia or elsewhere in the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, Mr. President, there are many items which will be covered by the Bureau in connection with the work of preparing the index, and it will be expensive to collect that information. I am simply saying that the Williams subcommittee found gross overstaffing, inferior planning, untrained supervision, and improvident administration. It further reported that the efficiency-rating system was misused, that employees falsified records by signing erroneous work-progress reports, that employees were threatened with punishment when they sought relief from those conditions, and that a substantial part of the \$1,000,000 originally appropriated for the consumers' price index was dissipated.

If those statements can be believed—and I have not heard them challenged—then I submit that on the basis of the record made thus far we would think that some savings could be made and that a cut of 20 percent below the budget estimate or approximately 10 percent below the amount recommended by the committee would not be inappropriate.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Like the Senator from Oklahoma, I should like to commend the Senator from Illinois for proposing in this way to make the reduction he recommends in the amount of the budget estimate for this agency. It seems to me that it is about time that some Members of Congress stopped proceeding on the idea that it is possible to order shrimp cocktail, soup, steak, salad, dessert, and coffee, so to speak, but when the check is submitted to Congress, having the proposal made, "Let us cut it 10 percent." It seems to me that if we are

to cut these items, we should cut them individually, and say, "This is where we are cutting." I commend the Senator from Illinois for the way he is going about this matter, item by item.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not exactly the purpose of my amendment to cut the specific items?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Ferguson amendment cuts each appropriation for personal service by a total of 10 percent. The Cordon amendment cuts each appropriation for personal service by 5 percent. The Ferguson amendment adds 5 percent to that reduction. I should prefer that we operate item by item, and that in these cases which I am now bringing forward the cuts be in excess of 10 percent. There are certain other items as to which my proposed cuts were less than that, but I am not asking for those at the present time. But I am asking that at least where the cuts are in excess of 10 percent, we adopt them; and I hope the Senator from Michigan will be willing to accept that proposal.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that all the items which the Senator from Illinois is now urging the Senator from Michigan to accept would be in conference, since the Senator from Illinois is cutting them below the House figures, and they will all, therefore, be in conference, notwithstanding the 10-percent cut?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Three of these items in my amendment provide for amounts less than the House figure, the Senate committee recommendation, and the Ferguson amendment. By accepting these, we would introduce lower figures in conference, but what I hope we can do on the other items in my amendment, I hold to the House figure. If they are accepted, we would remove the question from conference by having the Senate agree with the lower House figures, so that we may get the cuts through for certain, and we shall not have a possible movement afterward toward the higher Ferguson figures.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Does not the Senator from Illinois agree that there are certain items in the budget which can be reduced more than 10 percent, and that there are other items which should not be reduced by that figure?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is precisely so.

Mr. MOODY. It seems to me the meat-ax procedure of cutting all of them by an identical reduction across the board, is not the way to do it. I think we should cut each item as we come to it, as the Appropriations Committee endeavored to do, but go further whenever it can be done in the public interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish that might be the parliamentary situation, but it is

not; and in view of the fact that it is not the parliamentary situation, I am now going forward with the items covered by my amendment as to which the cuts are greater than those proposed by the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think perhaps I could set the minds of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan at rest, because there is to be an amendment offered to the Ferguson amendment, which will increase the cut by another 5 percent, so both Senators will have an opportunity to get the result they seek.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would be going a little bit too far, to make a 15 percent meat-ax cut—affecting all agencies, whether efficient or inefficient; whether performing a vital service or a less-essential service.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the Senator say how far he thinks the cut should go? He has said that 10 percent is not enough, so should we not go to 15?

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. First I should like to say that the 10 percent cut is not great enough in some cases, but is adequate in others. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to say to the Senator from Delaware that I am ready to endeavor to reduce each item when it should be reduced, as the Senator from Illinois is endeavoring to do, but an additional meat-ax cut is something that I think cannot be done in an intelligent way. I think we should take a stand on each item, and decide which items we should increase and which ones we should reduce.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Delaware for a question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I point out to the Senator from Michigan, if the Senator from Illinois will permit, that the individual items can still be amended and cut even though the Ferguson amendment is adopted. The Ferguson amendment applies only to personnel, and if we are only going to cut personnel by 5 or 10 percent, or 15 percent, it should be done across the board.

Mr. DOUGLAS. My understanding of the parliamentary situation is that, if the Ferguson amendment is to be adopted, further amendments on such items as grants for hospitals, and so forth, can be proposed; but amendments which affect items for which salaries are to be expended will be out of order. Thus, if we adopt the Ferguson amendment, in itself, we are closing the way to further selective cutting on items involving funds for salaries. Let us be clear regarding that.

Mr. President, I am also proposing a further reduction of approximately \$860,000 in assistance to the States primarily for the collection of vital statistics. The collection of vital statistics

has served a good purpose in the past in giving us a measuring rod of the seriousness of the health situation and enabling us to measure progress from time to time. It has been a very valuable stimulus, and the Federal system has helped us to build up, with the States and the counties, a very good method of recording death and sickness figures. But today, in this time of need for economy, certainly it seems as though we could make some reduction in the collection of figures. My proposal, therefore, is that we cut this item by a further amount of \$860,000.

Then I am also proposing that we make a reduction of \$12,930 below the Ferguson figure on that section within the Public Health Service which computes what the amounts are that each State may receive for the construction of hospitals; namely, the item for hospital construction services.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know the Senator from Illinois will agree with the Senator from Michigan that the Ferguson amendment will not interfere later with the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, as it relates to the items other than personnel.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; but that is what the amendment of the Senator from Michigan primarily refers to. That is the very point.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. For instance, the Senator from Illinois proposes an amendment regarding the promotion of vocational education, and his proposal is not precluded by action on the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That will be in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. And also grants for hospital construction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That will be in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. And grants to States in connection with maternal and child welfare.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Those will be in order. But the amendments directed to Government bureaus, any portion of whose funds will be spent for personnel, will not be in order.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, in order to forestall these amendments being out of order, I now appeal to the Senator from Michigan to make them his children, and then to the Senate to give unanimous consent that they be so made a part of his amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to answer that suggestion by saying that while I am in sympathy with the Senator from Illinois regarding his proposals, I think it is beyond the power of the Senator from Michigan as a Member of the Senate to agree to them. They are unacceptable, not through any reluctance on my part to accept them, but because, under the rules of the Senate, they are not in order.

In order to make the RECORD complete I should like to ask if the Senator from Illinois has not drafted his amendment to cover only these particular items because, in the case of seven other amend-

ments which he previously offered, the Ferguson amendment would cut deeper than he proposes to cut.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I am not offering those.

Mr. FERGUSON. In the case of those particular proposals my amendment would cut deeper than the cut which is proposed by his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The total amount by which the Ferguson amendment would cut more deeply than my other six amendments which are affected by his general amendment would be approximately \$250,000. In the case of the six amendments which I offer, they would cut more deeply than the Ferguson amendment by \$1,420,000. Therefore, I am waiving my first set of amendments, and am merely proposing the second set, in order that we may effect some further economies. It is well known that from a parliamentary standpoint the Senate can do anything it wants to do by unanimous consent. In this respect the procedure of the Senate differs from that of the House. Therefore, I am throwing myself on the mercy and the indulgence of the Senator from Michigan, and begging him to accept these additional cuts, in order to save \$1,420,000 for the taxpayers. I do not feel that I could look toward his face in vain.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan is agreeable but he feels that the Senator in charge of the bill, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], would not accept these particular further cuts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let us make a try for it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I suggest the Senator from Illinois make a request.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I now ask unanimous consent that these amendments be incorporated in the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I object.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank the Senator for the expression of courtesy, general approval, and support, but I am sorry that the taxpayers are not getting the \$1,420,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois wish the first part of his amendment to be considered?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, Mr. President, because, if the first part were to be considered without the second part, the result would be that the Ferguson cut would not apply to these items. We would be likely to end up with no cuts at all on these particular items.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois withdraws his amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan for himself and other Senators.

MALONE AMENDMENT—20 PERCENT REDUCTION IN CIVILIAN BUDGET

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I move to amend the Ferguson amendment by striking out in line 5, "five per centum" and substituting "ten per centum" as a substitute; my reason being that I submitted an amendment on Friday, June 8, which provided for a 20 percent cut, eliminating from the 20 percent reduction any of the pensions, fixed charges,

or trust funds. So that it may be in order, I offer my amendment to the Ferguson amendment before the Ferguson amendment is voted upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada offers an amendment, which the clerk will state.

The CHIEF CLERK. On line 5 of the so-called Ferguson amendment it is proposed to strike out "five per centum and insert "ten per centum."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada. Those in favor of the amendment will say "Aye."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Moody
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bricker	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Holland	O'Mahoney
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Pastore
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Clements	Kefauver	Smathers
Connally	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Eaton	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Underwood
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	McCarran	Welker
Frear	McCarthy	Wherry
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
George	McFarland	Young
Gillette	McKellar	
Green	McMahon	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the amendment is offered in lieu of the amendment offered on Friday, June 8, joined in by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

The amendment for which the substitute is offered follows:

CIVILIAN BUDGET CUT 20 PERCENT

At the proper place in the bill insert:
"Sec. —. The appropriations contained in the various items of the bill and any amounts authorized to be expended, with the exception of the Railroad Retirement Board appropriations, and that part of the Federal Security appropriations relating to

old-age pensions, are reduced respectively by the amount of 20 percent."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. The yeas and nays have been requested. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read before we vote on it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON for himself and other Senators, Mr. MALONE proposes, in line 5, after the words "equal to" to strike out "5" and insert "10", so as to make the Ferguson amendment read:

On page 42, between lines 15 and 16, insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 703. Each appropriation or authorization made by this act for any purpose, of which a specified portion is herein made available for personal services, and each amount so specified as being available for personal services, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, am I foreclosed from offering a modifying amendment, the yeas and nays already having been ordered on this amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not because the yeas and nays have been ordered, but because it would be an amendment in the third degree.

Mr. IVES. My amendment is in the same relationship to the bill itself as the Lehman amendment was to the Ferguson amendment. However, I understand that the pending amendment is a substitute for the Ferguson amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is an amendment to the Ferguson amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this vote with

the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming would vote "nay," and the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is necessarily absent, is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], who is absent on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation, is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—28

Bennett	Dworshak	McCarthy
Brewster	Eastland	Mundt
Bricker	Eaton	Schoeppel
Bridges	Ferguson	Watkins
Butler, Md.	Frear	Welker
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Wherry
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Williams
Cain	Ives	Young
Carlson	Jenner	
Dirksen	Malone	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Benton	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Clements	Kefauver	Nixon
Connally	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kilgore	Pastore
Douglas	Knowland	Robertson
Ellender	Langer	Russell
Flanders	Lehman	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Long	Smathers
George	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Gillette	Maybank	Smith, N. J.
Green	McCarran	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McClellan	Sparkman
Hennings	McFarland	Stennis
Hill	McKellar	Taft
Hoey	McMahon	Thye
Holland	Monroney	Underwood

NOT VOTING—14

Anderson	Hunt	Murray
Capehart	Keim	O'Connor
Case	Lodge	Tobey
Duff	Martin	Wiley
Humphrey	Millikin	

So Mr. MALONE's amendment to the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON for himself and other Senators was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. CHAVEZ and other Senators requested the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it too late to request that the amendment be read to the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is too late. The Senate is now proceeding to vote on the amendment, and one Senator voted when his name was called. The roll call cannot be interrupted for that purpose.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired on this vote with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea," and the Sen-

ator from Wyoming would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] who is absent on official business is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from South Dakota would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] who is absent because of illness is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Colorado would each vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on official business and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent on official business, and his pair has been announced previously by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—58

Bennett	George	Mundt
Brewster	Gillette	Nixon
Bricker	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Russell
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Schoeppel
Byrd	Ives	Snatchers
Cain	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Douglas	Kefauver	Taft
Duff	Knowland	Thye
Dworshak	Langer	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Eaton	McCarran	Wherry
Ferguson	McCarthy	Williams
Flanders	McClellan	Young
Frear	McKellar	
Fulbright	Morse	

NAYS—24

Aiken	Hennings	McMahon
Benton	Hill	Monroney
Chavez	Kerr	Moody
Clements	Kilgore	Neely
Cordon	Lehman	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Long	Pastore
Green	Maybank	Sparkman
Hayden	McFarland	Underwood

NOT VOTING—14

Anderson	Kem	Murray
Capehart	Lodge	O'Connor
Case	Magnuson	Tobey
Humphrey	Martin	Wiley
Hunt	Millikin	

So Mr. FERGUSON's amendment was agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF BEGUM IKRAMULLAH, OF PAKISTAN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires to call the attention of the Senate

to the fact that we have the honor of having with us on the floor of the Senate today, Begum Ikramullah, a Member of the Senate of Pakistan, and the wife of the Foreign Secretary of Pakistan. We are very happy to have this Member of the Pakistan Senate in our midst. We hope she is enjoying her visit to the United States and that she will bring to us much information from her country, and will take back to her country much information from ours, as a result of her visit.

The Chair thinks it would be appropriate for the Members of the Senate of the United States to rise and greet her as a Member of the Senate of Pakistan.

[The Members of the Senate rose, amidst applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will say that the Senator from Pakistan is welcome here, and she may remain as long as it suits her convenience.

BEGUM IKRAMULLAH. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful for the great privilege of being permitted to visit and sit in the Senate of the United States, the first country to achieve freedom, and now the greatest among the free nations.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk my amendment marked "6-7-51-T," and ask that it be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 7, strike out "two" and insert in lieu thereof "one."

On page 11, line 23, strike out "seven" and insert in lieu thereof "one."

On page 20, line 6, strike out "twenty" and insert in lieu thereof "seven."

On page 21, line 1, strike out "ten" and insert in lieu thereof "five."

On page 21, line 11, strike out "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof "ten."

On page 21, lines 23 and 24, and on page 22, line 1, strike out "eleven passenger motor vehicles, of which nine shall be for replacement only" and insert in lieu thereof "four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only."

On page 23, line 18, strike out "three passenger motor vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof "one passenger motor vehicle."

On page 24, line 2, strike out "fifteen" and insert in lieu thereof "nine."

On page 24, lines 19 and 20, strike out "twelve passenger motor vehicles of which ten shall be for replacement only" and insert in lieu thereof "five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only."

On page 25, line 2, strike out "six" and insert in lieu thereof "three."

On page 25, line 18, strike out "six" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

On page 26, line 10, strike out "two passenger motor vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof "one passenger motor vehicle."

On page 29, lines 1 and 2, strike out "two passenger motor vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof "one passenger motor vehicle."

On page 29, line 8, strike out "three passenger motor vehicles" and insert in lieu thereof "one passenger motor vehicle."

On page 30, line 5, strike out "four" and insert in lieu thereof "two."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. I would put the Government on a "fat boy's" diet. The amendment proposes that no additional automobiles be purchased during the coming year, and that only half the automobiles which are being worn out be replaced. Therefore, the amendment is an attempt to decrease the total number of passenger cars used to convey Government officials, by providing only half of the replacements and no net additions to the number of cars.

Mr. President, this amendment pinpoints one of the big sources of waste in the Government. An excessive number of passenger cars is in use in the civil establishment and, I also believe, in the military establishment.

I have before me, in this connection, the figures showing the number of private chauffeurs in the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency. There are nine full-time chauffeurs in the Department of Labor, in Washington. There are 37 full-time chauffeurs in Washington in the Federal Security Agency. These are the two agencies whose appropriations are covered in this bill. There are 46 full-time chauffeurs to drive cars carrying secretaries, administrators, under secretaries, assistant secretaries, assistants to the secretaries, assistants to the under secretaries, assistants to the assistant secretaries, and heads of bureaus.

Mr. President, if there is one service in our Government which needs to have its waistline reduced it is these motor pools, and the amendment is a step in that direction. If the amendment shall be adopted, or even if it shall not be adopted, I shall propose similar amendments to each and every appropriation bill which comes before the Senate. Here is a real chance to put the bureaucrats on a diet.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I noted, as I ran through the bill quickly, that some of the cars affected by the amendment are replacements only.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator's amendment prevails, and, let us say, we cut out "20" and insert "10," in instances where the cars are for replacement only, how would that cut down the number of cars? Why does not the amendment take care of the remaining old cars?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I assume the old cars are to be replaced, because they are wearing out; and, as they wear out and go to the graveyard, there will not be, if my amendment is adopted, so many new births. In short, the population in regard to cars will shrink by a death rate which will be twice that of the birth rate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I raised the question merely because it has been brought out in the hearings that the maintenance of one of these very old cars, some of which have traveled a mileage of 100,000 and even 150,000 miles, costs more than what a new car would cost. If the purpose of the Senator's amendment is to be realized in full, why should not the cars intended for replacement purposes be eliminated through trading the old cars for new ones?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We presume that the administrators of these various agencies have some intelligence, and that they would do precisely that; but so long as they are going to get new cars, they will not scrap the old. If we reduce the number of replacements, they will then have to turn the old cars in.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Would it not occur to the senior Senator from Illinois that if a bureaucrat had to undergo some stigma in connection with driving an old automobile, he might be encouraged to take a taxicab or to provide his own transportation, occasionally?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is a summation devoutly to be wished.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the favorite son of Nebraska, the dart thrower, the junior Senator from that State.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I merely desire to call attention to the Senator's amendment. I am for the amendment, and I shall vote for it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. But, in his second amendment, on page 11, line 23, the Senator proposes to strike out "7" and to insert "1." The amendment then goes on to say, "of which two shall be for replacement." I think the Senator probably wants to amend that amendment by adding "including the purchase of not to exceed possibly two automobiles," instead of striking the "seven." I think it is the only provision that does that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to modify my amendment, and strike the word "two" and insert "one" where the number refers to replacements. I thank my genial friend from Nebraska for pointing out to me this technical oversight.

Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield first to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am fully in accord with what is intended to be done by my friend from Illinois. I am fearful, however, that, even though the amendment were adopted, it would still not strike any of the actual sums recommended. Has the Senator checked to make sure that that result would be accomplished?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would, because the budget which has been prepared is based upon a justification which

included these items, and if these items are eliminated, it would be hard to expand other items accordingly. It is very hard to attach a dollar figure to these items, because, for various reasons, we do not know what the precise cost of an automobile will be in all cases; but I may say that the amendment would eliminate about 79 automobiles, and should effect a saving of approximately \$100,000.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am completely in accord with the proposal to eliminate the stated number of automobiles. The only thing of which I am not sure—and I am inclined to think that this observation may be true—is that the money saving intended to be effected might not be realized, and, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, would not be, unless the items set forth in each of the paragraphs intended to be amended, comprised all the items of the budget covered by the blanket appropriation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe the total is built up of a series of individual items within each appropriation, items which are not printed in the bill, but which are contained in the justifications, which are shown in files we have in my office, and therefore the total appropriation would be reduced. The point is that because we do not know what the precise cost of each automobile would be in the coming year, it is difficult to attach a precise dollar figure to an economy. But I may say that we find that the average f. o. b. cost without equipment is about \$1,250, and if we eliminate 79 automobiles we can assume that it would effect a saving of about \$100,000.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to make a unanimous-consent request. I should like to invite attention for a moment particularly the attention of the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] to the request I am about to make.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Michigan for that purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator for that purpose, without prejudice to my rights to the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. A few moments ago the Senate, by a large vote, confirmed the principle of cutting payrolls 10 percent below the budget estimates. There has been reported to the Senate today, from the Appropriations Committee, the independent offices bill, which is in charge of the Senator from South Carolina. I ask unanimous consent that that bill may be recommitted to the committee, and that the committee review the question of a 10-percent cut on personal services. I am sure that if the bill went back to the committee with a mandate from the Senate, a considerable amount of debate on the floor of the Senate could be saved in connection with that particular bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

MR. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I merely wish to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan that I did not vote for the 10-percent cut, because, in committee, I thought we had worked out a provision which was satisfactory, after the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] and others of us had labored for a long time to cut the appropriation 5 percent plus all the direct cuts. I feel sure that my good friend from Michigan will agree that in the committee I voted for the total cuts.

In the case of the independent offices bill, I do not want to brag about the committee, but the Senate should know that we have reduced the bill below last year's figure by \$5,679,000,000, which is \$600,000,000 below the budget estimates.

I can well appreciate that the Senate desires a 10-percent cut, and I have no objection to having the bill go back to the committee. As a matter of fact, I did not vote for such a cut, because it would establish a pattern. As I said in committee, if it was adopted, I would support a 10-percent cut on all of those items. I made that statement in connection with voting for many of the reductions, as the Senator from Michigan knows.

MR. FERGUSON. That is correct.

MR. MAYBANK. Also, I voted to eliminate the provisions for the purchase of automobiles.

MR. FERGUSON. That is correct.

MR. MAYBANK. The Senator and I tried long and hard to eliminate the provisions for the purchase of automobiles, so I am in the position of not having voted for the 10-percent cut, but of having voted for the individual cuts, in committee, and of having voted with the Senator on the automobile situation.

MR. FERGUSON. That is correct.

MR. MAYBANK. I wish to make my position perfectly clear. I stated when we had the final vote that I was going to vote for the 5-percent cut on the Labor-Security bill, but that if the Senate made a 10-percent cut, I was going to reserve the right to vote for a 10-percent cut in the other bills which came before the Senate, including the military bill, and all other bills, because that is where the real money is. We have already reduced the independent-offices bill to the extent of \$5,669,000,000, which is \$600,000,000 below the budget. I cast my vote, too—and I discussed it in committee with the Senator from Michigan and with other Members—as a test vote on whether there should be a 5-percent or a 10-percent cut in addition. So I have no desire to object to sending the bill back to the committee. In fact, I am going to vote for the 10-percent cut, and I am going to vote for more than a 10-percent cut when the legislative bill comes up; and, so far as European aid in the sum of \$8,500,000,000 is concerned, I may vote for much more than a 10-percent cut.

I merely wanted to make the record clear as to why I voted as I did today,

because we worked long and hard. I worked with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to figure out a 5-percent cut; and the Senator knows that when a 5-percent cut was made in the Labor-Security bill, I asked the committee for permission, which was given me, to have Mr. Earl W. Cooper, the clerk of the subcommittee, of which I am chairman, prepare figures to show the effect of the 5-percent cut. He spent all night preparing those figures. The figures showed that with the 5 percent plus direct cuts, the independent-offices bill would be reduced by \$600,000,000 below the budget estimate and \$5,669,000,000 below what we voted last year.

I shall vote for the 10-percent cut, and I shall vote for more than a 10-percent cut when the foreign-aid bills come before the Senate.

MR. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. MAYBANK. I shall be glad to yield.

MR. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator if the effect of what he is suggesting would not be for us to say that the Appropriations Committee is invariably appropriating too much money, no matter what figure is arrived at. I am not a member of the Appropriations Committee, but I am inclined to think that the members of that committee are sincere gentlemen and are trying to do their duty.

MR. MAYBANK. There is no finer committee than the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I appreciate the honor of serving with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEELAR], who is chairman of that committee. A majority of the members of the committee voted for a 10-percent cut. I hoped it would establish a pattern, because, if we cut one agency of Government 10 percent, then the others should be cut a like amount. In fact, some of them ought to be cut 50 percent.

MR. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

MR. MAYBANK. Yes.

MR. LONG. The question that is troubling me is that if the majority of the members of the Appropriations Committee voted for a 5- or 10-percent cut, why was so much money reported in the first place?

MR. MAYBANK. I cannot answer that question. I listened to the testimony. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] proposed a 5-percent cut, and I tried to do what I could do for the people of this country. I know we cannot legislate on the Senate floor. But I am going to vote for a 10-percent cut in the independent offices appropriation bill, although we have already cut those appropriations to the extent of \$600,000,000 below the budget, and five billion six hundred million below the appropriations for last year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Michigan that the independent offices appropriation bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations?

MR. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think we should have an opportunity to go over

the bill item by item, instead of throwing up our hands in despair and sending the bill back to the committee. So I object.

MR. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I went over the bill item by item, not only in the morning, not only in the afternoon, but even at my home at night.

MR. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that the Senator moved—

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was not a motion. The Senator from Michigan asked unanimous consent that the independent offices bill be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

MR. DOUGLAS. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is recommitted.

If the Chair may be permitted, with the indulgence of the Senate, to make a suggestion, it is that the committee itself make the reductions item by item.

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President, that is what the Senator from Michigan had in mind. He made the motion in the committee that there be a 10-percent cut.

MR. MAYBANK. That is correct. I assured the Senator from Michigan that if we placed a 10-percent cut on one bill the same should be done as to all bills as far as my vote was concerned.

MR. FERGUSON. That is correct.

MR. MAYBANK subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Independent Offices, I submitted the independent offices appropriation bill for 1952, which, by a unanimous-consent agreement, was recommitted to the committee on request of the Senator from Michigan. I now wish to ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed, in order that we may have the bill before the Senate on Thursday. As I understand, the calendar will be called tomorrow.

I may say that the additional 5-percent cut has been carefully checked by the staff, and it amounts to \$14,223,997. I ask that that breakdown also be included as part of my remarks at this point, showing where the cuts will be made.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL,
1952, H. R. 3880

The Senate has recommitted H. R. 3880, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1952, with directions agreed to in colloquy to reduce personal services in each item of appropriation by 10 percent, in lieu of the 5-percent reduction in personal services made by full committee action.

Subject to final checking, such action would reduce individual items in the bill as follows:

Bureau of the Budget.....	\$191,125
Council of Economic Advisers....	9,750
American Battle Monuments Commission	26,115
Federal Communications Com- mission	166,700
Federal Power Commission.....	180,575
Federal Trade Commission.....	152,561
General Services Administra- tion	3,242,207

Indian Claims Commission.....	\$4,700
Interstate Commerce Commission:	
General expenses.....	65,000
Railroad safety.....	37,724
Locomotive inspection.....	28,240
Motor Carrier Claims Commission.....	1,750
National Advisory Commission on Aeronautics.....	1,750,480
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	272,760
Smithsonian Institution.....	96,680
National Gallery of Art.....	59,420
Tariff Commission.....	60,700
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	528,260
Tax Court of United States.....	37,950
Veterans' Administration.....	6,986,000
Maritime:	
Salaries.....	201,050
Training.....	124,250
Total.....	14,223,997

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, we will file a report as soon as it is ready. Each individual item of the report must be changed, because of the additional 5 percent cut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONRONEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FERGUSON. Reserving the right to object, when the bill is printed, will it contain the new figures, showing the cut of \$14,000,000 plus?

Mr. MAYBANK. It will appear in another printing of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the bill be printed again, and be on the desks of Senators, so that they may understand fully how the additional cuts were made?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct. That is what I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I understand this is a unanimous-consent request for the printing of a bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the bill been returned to the Senate?

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill was recommended, by unanimous consent, to the committee, and in the meantime I have directed the committee staff to prepare a statement showing the additional 5 percent cut. Those figures have been prepared by Mr. Earl W. Cooper, of our staff, and we shall reprint the bill with the new 5 percent cut added—that is, showing the 10 percent cut, instead of a 5 percent cut, as it was originally.

Mr. WHERRY. When does the Senator expect to report the bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. It will merely be a matter of submitting it to the full committee. However, we desire to have the bill printed, with the necessary corrections, in order that Senators may have it before them.

Mr. WHERRY. I appreciate that, but the point I wanted to bring out is that the proper way to handle these bills is to let them lie over for a day, as provided by the rules. So far as I am concerned, it is agreeable to have the bill printed again. This is Tuesday. If it can be printed tomorrow, we can take it

up following the call of the calendar on Thursday. That, I understand, is the program.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is what I had hoped.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

Mr. MAYBANK. I spoke to the chairman of the committee, and he thought he would poll the members of the committee to see if it were agreeable to them. Thus far, four Senators, namely, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and myself are here, and they have seen the figures showing the changes.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator mean it will be submitted from the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder when my turn will come.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator's turn will come now.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may we proceed now to the discussion of the pending bill, and finish it, so that we may get ready for the next one?

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope there will not be any objection to the proposed reduction of 79 in the total number of Government automobiles. I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment very speedily.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I am very much in favor of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, and I shall support it, but it occurred to me that the Senator might be able to get a more certain reduction in this field if he merely offered an amendment to require the Department immediately to dispose of 50 percent of its automobiles, based on the highest mileage, and then for the Department to get rid of the automobiles, instead of adopting this uncertain process of replacement. The Department might go along under this admonition with a lot of old automobiles for an interminable period of time and not get rid of them because they can replace only half of them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] has a suggestion which will clear this matter up. The Senator from Iowa is proposing that we reduce by one-half the total number of automobiles. I think that is probably too stringent a proposal. What I am proposing is that we replace one-half of the total change during the year. The proposal of the Senator from Iowa would require civilian branches to dispose of

approximately 10,000 automobiles during the course of the year, because approximately 20,000 are in the civilian branches. My proposal is that of the 3,000 which are scheduled for replacement, we permit the replacement of only 1,500, and thereby shrink the total number.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to ask the Senator if he drives through Rock Creek Park in the mornings. If he does, I think he will see there at least 10,000 Government automobiles, most of which seem to be driven by Government chauffeurs, taking lower-echelon employees to work so that they can get there by 9 o'clock. I think a reduction of 50 percent could well be absorbed in the motor-vehicle pool, and I think it should be done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the Senator will go along with me in my proposal.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am going along with the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who I think has a suggestion to offer.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I voted in the committee to do away with 1,760 chauffeurs. There are 5,280 on part time. I was defeated in the committee. But there are 5,280 part-time chauffeurs and 1,760 regular chauffeurs. I certainly think the Senator should modify his amendment to do away with the chauffeurs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Michigan has an amendment having to do with chauffeurs, and I do not want to poach in his territory. If there is to be a reduction in the number of chauffeurs I am perfectly willing that the Senator from Michigan should receive the credit for it. If we reduce the number of automobiles for the first step, we can reduce the number of chauffeurs for the second step. But I do not want to fish in another man's pond unless I first ask his consent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should first like to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, because I think he has a very constructive amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator from Illinois be willing to accept an amendment to his amendment "T" reading as follows:

SEC. —. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only are reduced by the provisions in this act, the total number of passenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be delighted to accept that amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. FREAR addressed the chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it appears that the Senate is in a mood of

economy. The chairman of the subcommittee is willing to accept not only the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois with reference to automobiles, but the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and thereby try to do a little economizing on our own part.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask to call up the amendment so that it may be understood.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I suggest that we proceed item by item, that the Senate accept my amendment and then accept the amendment of the Senator from Michigan later.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am in favor of economizing on our own part.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct. Let us do away with the chauffeurs.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if the reduction he proposes in the number of automobiles for the Food and Drug Administration will take away the automobiles with which the Food and Drug Administration has been futilely and feebly attempting to enforce the oleomargarine law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It will affect it somewhat, but I think the Food and Drug Administration has enough cars so if they want to enforce the Food and Drug Act they can do so.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Illinois familiar with the testimony before the Finance Committee that it would take \$5,000,000 to enforce the Oleomargarine Act, and that only \$225,000 is provided in this bill for such enforcement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was not aware of that fact.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the Senator from Illinois aware of the fact that of the 16,000 eating places which have been inspected under the oleomargarine law, from November 1 until May 1 of this year, between 20 and 30 percent were found in violation, but that none have been referred to the Department of Justice for prosecution?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I thank the Senator for that information.

Mr. AIKEN. Therefore, I was wondering, if any of the automobiles which would be eliminated were used for the enforcement of the oleomargarine law, just what the effect would be, so far as enforcement is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will examine the figures for the Federal Security Agency he will find that they have a very large number of automobiles, 37 with full-time drivers in the District of Columbia, 7 with full-time drivers in the field, 13 with part-time drivers in the District of Columbia, and 87 with part-time drivers in the field. Seventy-six vehicles are operated by persons not employed as chauffeurs in the District of Columbia, and 1,006 in the field. So that in all they have about

1,200 automobiles. I do not believe that the loss of 3 or 4 of the 1,200 automobiles would seriously handicap them in the enforcement of the oleomargarine law.

Mr. AIKEN. I think I can agree with the Senator on this amendment. I simply wanted to make sure that the enforcement of the oleomargarine law would not fall below the zero point, where it is at present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe we have established a legislative record indicating that it is the intent of the Senate that the oleomargarine law shall be enforced, and in view of the fact that the Federal Security Agency has nearly 1,200 automobiles, it seems to me that there should not be such a shortage of automobiles as to interfere with the enforcement of the oleomargarine law.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I have been on my feet for a long time seeking to have the Senator from Illinois yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. I am not particularly interested in how many automobiles are going to be used for the enforcement of the oleomargarine law, because I think it is a poor law, in the form in which it was passed. The question I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois is whether the modification of his amendment suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], which the chairman of the subcommittee said he was willing to accept, now gives assurance that the automobiles in question will not be in use in the departments and agencies affected at the end of the present fiscal year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is correct, yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I presume I shall be one of the conferees. If the amendment is accepted I shall certainly try to carry out the instructions of the Senate as contained in it. But, after all, the House has something to say about a conference. All the Senator from New Mexico can assure the Senator from Delaware is that certainly the conferees on the part of the Senate will try to carry out the instructions of the Senate.

I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Vermont. He inquired about certain automobiles. The amendments of the Senator from Illinois go to individual items. The particular point in which the Senator from Vermont is interested is on line 3 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois. That part of the amendment reads:

On page 11, line 23, strike out "seven" and insert in lieu thereof "one."

So as far as replacements for the Food and Drug Administration are concerned, the amendment would result in the replacement of only one automobile, instead of seven, as recommended by the committee. I was glad the Senator from Vermont called attention to that item.

The oleomargarine law may not be any good; but Congress passed it. Many persons have objections to the oleomargarine law, but it has been passed by Congress. All we ask is that the Food and Drug Administration be permitted to administer the law as it should be administered.

Mr. AIKEN. Congress has been warned that it would require four or five million dollars annually to enforce the law. We cannot expect enforcement of the law by the Food and Drug Administration, because they told us they could not do the job with \$225,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May I speak for one more moment? I beg the indulgence of the Senator to say a few more words.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield further to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator. This is the story about the enforcement of the oleomargarine law. The Bureau of the Budget recommended \$900,000 as last year's appropriation. We cut that amount in two. The Administration does not have a sufficient number of enforcement officers in Washington to inspect the greasy spoon restaurants on Indiana Avenue, much less 16,000 restaurants. But we ask them to do these things, and then if they cannot do them, we complain. If there is one agency of the Federal Government that deserves the sincere support of this body, it is the Food and Drug Administration. Of course it should not waste money, but it should be encouraged to enforce the law for the sake of the public health.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to correct any impression which may have been given by my remarks that there are fifteen or sixteen thousand restaurants to be inspected. That is the number which has been inspected since last November, and at that rate of inspection the enforcement officers can get around to each restaurant probably every 5 or 6 years.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I believe the testimony before the committee was that there were more than 800,000 restaurants to be inspected. They simply cannot reach them all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand that the amendment which I offered, as modified by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], has been accepted by the committee?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As modified?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. Which applies only to cutting down the replacement cars.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It eliminates additional net increases, too.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. And, of course, when the Senator from Michigan presents his amendment it is my purpose to accept it also. That refers to the chauffeurs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In answer to the parliamentary inquiry of the Senator from Illinois the Chair will state that the chairman of the subcommittee has just indicated that he will accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, as modified.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I now call up the amendment dated over 6-8-51—C which I offer for myself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 42, between lines 15 and 16, it is proposed to insert a new section as follows:

SEC. —. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government, whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), and any funds appropriated in this act for any such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. FERGUSON. Do I understand that the Senator in charge of the bill accepts the amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, so far as the chairman of the subcommittee is concerned, I accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I now offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 42, after line 15, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are beginning to close in on the specific sources of waste in the Federal Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It appears that the proposed amendment would be legislation on an appropriation bill, and that is why I make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for the expression of the point of order?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to discuss that question if I may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it seems to be well established that restrictions may be placed on the use of funds.

The pending bill already contains a restriction, providing that no money shall be paid to anyone who engages in a strike in the Government service. As a matter of fact, I believe that the independent offices bill, House bill 3880, which was just recommitted to the committee, contains a provision on page 43 similar to that in my amendment, in fact, it is identical.

This is merely an attempt to extend to the Labor and Federal Security Agency the provision which the House has already established in the case of independent offices.

There are many restrictions which are placed upon the expenditure of funds. My amendment is not legislation, but a restriction on the use of funds. The chauffeurs amendment, I may say, is of the same type, because it places a restriction upon the expenditure of funds. It provides that no funds shall be used to pay full-time or part-time chauffeurs. So I am sorry that the point of order has been raised. If this amendment is knocked out, we shall have to knock out the provision with respect to chauffeurs.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. The point I wish to make with the Senator from Illinois is that I think he has phrased this provision in such a way that it is a restriction rather than new legislation. Is not that true?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have certainly tried to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico formally make the point of order?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order on the Senator from New Mexico is well taken.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I move to suspend the rule.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to suspend the rule is not in order except on 1 day's notice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the restriction in this case is identical with the restriction which has just been made with respect to the hiring of chauffeurs. That was permitted to go through. Now the ruling is made that this provision is legislation, and it is ruled out. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the

gander. In my judgment, both provisions are correct.

Mr. President, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the appeal comes too late. We have passed on to another matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know of no other matter which has come before the Senate. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, is that question debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appeal is debatable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the independent offices bill, as passed by the House, on page 43, section 108 reads as follows:

SEC. 108. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employees to 115 or a part thereof, full-time, part-time and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

In other words, the clause which I offered in my amendment is identical with that which has already been placed in the independent offices bill by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that that language was placed in the bill on the House side?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only that, but by action of this body this afternoon, that bill has gone back to the Committee on Appropriations. So we do not know what the committee will report to the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that such a provision is also in Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, second session.

Mr. President, this agency happens to be extremely guilty of an excessive use of persons in the personnel department. The Williams committee in its report indicated that there was 1 personnel officer for every 63 employees in the Federal Security Administration, despite the fact that the Bureau of the Budget said that the proper ratio was 1 to 103, and despite the fact that the House Committee on Appropriations and the House of Representatives as a whole believes the proper ratio to be 1 to 115. The Federal Security Agency is one of the worst offenders in the Government in the excessive number of people in the personnel department.

Mr. President, the personnel officers are rapidly becoming the dictators of this country through their power to hire. They are able to manipulate the civil-service laws and put their own favorites in, excluding everyone else. They hold the power of life and death over the employees. They are becoming the modern dictators of the big bureaucracy which we are building up.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there cannot be any question whatever about the statement made by the Senator from Illinois. However, I still want the Senate to act in a legal and proper and constitutional way. Even if everything the Senator from Illinois says is correct—

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from New Mexico say that the House has acted illegally?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, if it was proper for the House, why is it not proper for us?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is this difference as between the House action and the Senate action: the House Committee inserted the language in the bill. Of course the Senate could not raise a point of order with respect to House action, but the Senate certainly can raise a point of order when an attempt is made to change the legislative process with respect to appropriation bills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and ask for a division.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not want to delay matters by calling for a quorum. I am not asking for a quorum, but I am asking for a division among those Senators who are present.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. IVES. I division on what?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I division on the question as to whether the ruling of the Chair was correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Does the Senator from Idaho insist upon his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to my colleague from Illinois for a moment.

Quite aside from the effect of the proposal which he offers, and looking at it only from the parliamentary standpoint, I think my friend will agree that, first of all, the amendment does impose an additional duty in that someone must make the determination as to which employees are engaged in part-time

work, half-time work, and so forth. That is an administrative duty which is imposed by the amendment; and if it is, of course it is clear that when we add additional duties the amendment becomes legislative in character. My own notion is that the ruling of the Chair is correct.

My friend raises the question as to how the provision got into the House bill. The reason for that is very simple. It is necessary to go to the Rules Committee of the House and obtain a rule which will waive all points of order with respect to an appropriation bill. I have not the slightest doubt that that was done in connection with the Independent Offices appropriation bill.

My own view, strictly from the parliamentary standpoint, is that the ruling of the Chair is correct, that the amendment does impose added duties, and therefore it is legislative in character.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the junior Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. Furthermore, as the junior Senator from Illinois will confirm, the rules of the Senate in the matter of legislation on an appropriation bill are stronger than are the rules of the House. The House has what the junior Senator from Illinois will recall as the Holman rule, I believe, which provides that if legislation is written in such a way that it appears on the face of it to be a reduction in an expenditure, even though it be legislation, it is in order in the House. The Senate has no such rule. In other words, the rules of the House are more generous and more liberal so far as legislation on appropriation bills is concerned than are the rules of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	McMahon
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Benton	Hendrickson	Moody
Brewster	Hennings	Morse
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Ives	Pastore
Cain	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Connally	Kefauver	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Langer	Sparkman
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ecton	Magnuson	Thye
Ellender	Malone	Underwood
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	McCarran	Welker
Frear	McCarthy	Wherry
Fulbright	McClellan	Williams
George	McFarland	Young
Gillette	McKellar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. The Senator from Michigan feels that the amendment under discussion is a good amendment, and a similar provision is in the independent offices appropriation bill. The President asked for it in his budget, as appears on page 143.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It makes me very happy that the Senator from Michigan pays attention to what the President asks for.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senator from Michigan agrees with the President, naturally he pays attention to him. On a number of items he agrees with the President.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad we are non-partisan.

Mr. FERGUSON. This provision is in the budget which the President asked Congress to adopt. I know of no reason why it was not recommended as a part of this bill. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will not insist upon the point of order, but will allow the amendment to become a part of the bill, so that it may be taken to conference. As I have said, a similar provision is now in the independent offices appropriation bill, which has been returned to the committee by unanimous consent, and it should have been included in this bill.

Let me read from the budget recommendation for independent offices for the information of the Senate:

Sec. (109) 108. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

Mr. President, if that provision is to be in the independent offices appropriation bill on the recommendation of the President, the Senator from Michigan feels that it should go into the pending bill, and in the other appropriation bills, as a matter of course.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I should like to say a word in support of what my colleague from Michigan has just stated. It seems to me that the method suggested of making reductions in specific items is the proper manner in which to act on appropriation bills. I hope the Senator from New Mexico will accept the amendment as the Senator from Illinois has offered it.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank my colleague for his cooperation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am sure there is much merit in the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois, as advocated by the Senator from Michigan. The only point I am attempting to make at this time is that the Senator from Michigan is too good a lawyer, he practiced law too long, he dispensed justice

too long, to approve of the proposed action. That being the case, all the Senator from New Mexico is asking was that the Senate proceed in the proper and orderly way, legally.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a minute?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Which would the Senator prefer to have: Justice in an illegal way or injustice in a legal way?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall answer that \$65 question by saying that I would rather have justice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In an illegal way?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I said I would rather have justice—either in a legal way or in an illegal way.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the Senator would waive technical objections to this amendment, in order to reach the consummation with which he says he agrees. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; I do agree.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from New Mexico remember the quotation from the Merchant of Venice:

To do a great right, do a little wrong,
And curb this cruel tyrant of his will.

The tyrant in this case is the wasteful bureaucrat, the tax eater, who will eat us into inflation if we fail to curb his appetite.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not remember it, but I believe in it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, is the Senator from New Mexico willing to accept the amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I might be willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Illinois if the Senator from Illinois would be willing to save a little of the money that is spent in trying to obtain reductions which are unsound, in the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee.

If the Senator from Illinois in all his goodness and patriotism and loyalty to the country and to the people of the country would cooperate a little and would trust the Appropriations Committee, which also is trying to save some money—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the committee is doing that. We simply wish to supplement the committee's splendid efforts and help the committee to do still more than it was originally able to do.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is fine. I am glad the Senator from Illinois is cooperating at least to that extent, but I should like to have this bill passed so that it may go to conference.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator accept the amendment, then?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it the last one the Senator from Illinois will submit?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I have many more, but I shall submit them quickly.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well; I accept the amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate that very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the point of order is withdrawn.

The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was agreed to, as follows:

On page 42, after line 15, insert the following:

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk another amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, in line 20, it is proposed to strike out "\$20,017,760" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,223,261."

On page 14, line 23, it is proposed to strike out "\$19,847,760" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,048,261."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to reduce the total amount of the appropriations for Federal aid for vocational education by \$1,800,000. I am not insisting that we restore the strict restriction the House imposed when it provided that no money whatever could be used for distributive education.

This amendment would permit the money to be used for distributive education—or, in other words, for training in selling, although I do not think much of having the program in operation right now—as well for training in agriculture, industrial arts, and home economics. In other words, the amendment would permit the same purposes as those now provided for in the bill to be carried out, but would appropriate \$1,800,000 less, or the sum total which the House of Representatives appropriated.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for a question.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I was seeking to obtain the floor in my own right, and I shall attempt to obtain it later, after the Senator from Illinois has concluded.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Senator from Illinois know whether arrangements have already been made by the States for setting up their entire educational systems for the fiscal year which is about to begin?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly the House must know about that, and it is always possible to readjust such arrangements.

I think the Senator from Ohio has in the past been one of those who have objected to having the hands of Congress tied by administrative arrangements

made prior to the time when the Congress acts on the appropriation bills.

Mr. TAFT. However, I know that in connection with highways, for instance, contracts have already been made and commitments have been made a full year in advance. In the case of highways, we cannot, without backing out from the contracts, reduce the appropriations for the fiscal year which is about to begin. I am asking whether the same is true in the case of the vocational education system. I do not know; but, of course, the State legislatures have already met and have made their appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1. Although we may make cuts in the appropriations for the following fiscal year, I am not sure that we can make cuts in the appropriations for this year for this purpose without violating the contracts which have been made with the Government of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have always taken the position that the United States Congress, not the administrative officials of the Government, is the proper appropriating body. The administrative officials make tentative arrangements and tentative contracts which always are subject to ratification by the Congress, which may or may not decide to appropriate sufficient funds to make those arrangements good.

If we do not retain that right, we surrender all control over appropriation items and we virtually turn that control over to the administrative officials, without retaining the power to act.

It is perfectly possible for the States to reduce their expenditures, either by spending \$1,800,000 less or by going through with their present program on a scale which would give them about a 90-percent reimbursement, instead of a 100-percent reimbursement; and they could either spend up to the amount of their appropriations or could turn back into the Treasury the amounts not spent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think the Senator from Illinois misinterprets the situation. There is no question of having Congress lose authority. The situation is that the Congress authorized the States to proceed in such a way as to constitute the making of contracts with the Federal Government. I do not think we should repudiate those agreements.

We may make changes in the appropriations and programs for the next year; but today the State legislatures have adjourned, after having set up their systems for the fiscal year beginning the 1st of July. In any event, the State legislatures cannot be called back to change the arrangements which now have been made for the new fiscal year.

I simply ask whether the Senator from Illinois has examined the situation in regard to vocational education. I have examined the situation in respect to the highway appropriations; but I do not know about the situation in respect to vocational education, and I think that point should be considered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. The reduction proposed by this amendment

is the same in amount as the reduction made by the House of Representatives, but the House added a further restriction, which is not included in my amendment, namely, that no funds should be spent for so-called distributive education. The Members of the House of Representatives are very competent gentlemen. The members of the House Appropriations Committee are probably quite expert in regard to this matter, particularly inasmuch as the House specializes more in appropriations than the Senate does. I am certain that the Members of the House must have examined this matter very carefully. If they reach this conclusion, it seems to me that it is almost *prima facie* that they are correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to call attention to the fact that the State legislatures have now adjourned, and it will be impossible for them to make adjustments on the basis of this bill, without holding special sessions—provided, of course, that the arrangements have been legally made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Vermont for the reinforcement he has given me.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator from Illinois know that the Senate Appropriations Committee passed on the very matter on which the House of Representatives passed, and the Senate committee recommended that the figure now set forth in the committee amendment be included in the bill?

However, the Senator's amendment would seek to change the figure which has been voted by the Senate committee, by striking it out and inserting, instead, the amount voted by the House of Representatives. Is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. My amendment, if adopted, would result in saving \$1,800,000 in the appropriation for vocational education. It could be made in distributive education, for education in selling, or it could be made on an over-all basis.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator from Illinois recall that last year we fought out this matter; and after the Senate voted three times—the last time by an overwhelming vote—the Senate approved this fund, under the George-Barden Act?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am still hoping that we shall be able to save on this item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The authorization for the item for vocational education is \$29,500,000. The Budget Bureau did not recommend the full authorization. It recommended \$20,017,760. For what purpose? For vocational education, a program which had been authorized by the Congress. Very well. The House cut the item down to the figure to which the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would now cut it. But the Sen-

ate committee did not feel that the House had done the proper thing, and we restored only the budget figure. We did not go as far as the authorization of \$29,000,000-plus, but only to the extent of \$20,017,760; and for a noble purpose. I may say that every time 1 cent is cut from a vocational educational training program for those who need it, it does not represent real economy, for it is keeping someone from becoming a producer, it is keeping someone from becoming a taxpayer. That is the only reason for our being opposed to the amendment of the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico for putting his objection to my amendment on the ground of policy rather than on the ground of legality, as was the case with the Senator from Ohio. If I may clinch the argument against the Senator from Ohio, it is this: If the Budget Bureau in January thought it legal to cut the authorization from \$29,000,000 to a little over \$20,000,000, then certainly it was legal for the House in April to cut it further to the extent of \$1,800,000, and it is similarly legal for the Senate now, in June, to adopt the House figure of \$1,800,000 below the budget figure. So I am glad that the Senator from New Mexico approves of the legal position of the Senator from Illinois.

On the question of policy, I may say we are in an emergency. We must save from \$4,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000 at a minimum, and although, when each item comes up, we think of the good which the expenditure of that amount will accomplish, we must always keep in mind as the overruling consideration the tremendous need of economy, and the fact that we have to cut the budget \$4,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000, or we shall have inflation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not completely in agreement with the Senator from Illinois as to the Senator from Ohio's being in error as to his legal conclusion, because, while it is true that the House had the legal authority to cut the appropriation from \$20,000,000 to \$18,000,000, or to \$3,000,000, and there is no question as to the legal authority of the House to do that—

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is no question of the legal authority of the Senate to do it, either.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then we are together on that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are together. But what the Senator from Ohio stated is correct. The State legislatures meet but once every 2 years. The Senate and the House of Representatives are not the only appropriative bodies in the country. Every State of the Union has a legislative body which appropriates money for the purpose of carrying out the functions of State government. Depending upon the program which the Federal Government is carrying out, the States make their appropriations. In New Mexico, for instance, for highways,

the State government authorizes an expenditure. The Federal Government authorizes an expenditure of \$500,000,000 a year to be spent throughout the country as a contribution by the Federal Government to the building of a highway system. The contributions of the Government must be matched by the individual States. In the instance of vocational training, to a certain extent the Federal Government's contributions must be matched by the individual States, and that is why the individual States must know what the Government is going to do about this particular matter.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is a difference in the point of view. The Senator from Illinois feels that this cut of \$1,800,000 should be made, while the Senator from New Mexico feels that it should not be made. I do not wish to take too much time. Unless there is more discussion, I suggest that the Senate vote on the question.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. I support the Senator from Illinois on this particular amendment. I wonder whether he is aware of the statement which appears in the House report to the effect that the real idea in the minds of the Budget Bureau at the time this budget was prepared was that, under the George-Barden Act, there should be only about \$10,000,000 employed for regular vocational education, and that the remainder should be used solely for vocational education in defense fields. The House itself changed that, put it back under the George-Barden funds, and appropriated approximately \$1,790,000 less than the budget figure. That much was eliminated, because that amount was intended to be used for education in the field of employment in retail establishments. Distributive education means nothing more than that, as I understand.

If the amendment of the Senator from Illinois should prevail all the funds which otherwise would have been divided substantially half and half, would go to the George-Barden fund and real vocational education. I am sure the country can limp along during the emergency and let the retail establishments train their own help, as they have done in the past.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to thank the Senator from Oregon for his very eloquent support of my proposal.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to make a statement regarding this matter. The Senator from Oregon is entirely in error. He has wholly misconceived the George-Barden act and the various other educational acts. The act itself provides for vocational education. There are various subjects which can be taught. Distributive education is simply one subject which may be taught under it. The authorization made by the Congress is

\$29,500,000 for the total program. The Congress has never appropriated it, because, when it would have been appropriated, no doubt, war was in progress, and there was not a sufficient number of trained vocational education teachers in the country to take care of the schools which the States wished to establish. But never has 50 percent of the total amount appropriated been used for distributive education.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon did not make any such statement.

Mr. GEORGE. I understood the Senator to make it. What happened was that someone in the executive branch of the Government decided to turn half of the money over to the Department of Labor. I wish to speak plainly. I protested against it, and when I protested against it, a change actually resulted from that protest; so that the amount appropriated goes for vocational education, including home economics, agricultural training, training on the farm, and mechanical training, and numerous other items.

I do not know whose bright idea it was, but the first I learned about it was that they desired about \$20,000,000 be appropriated, but with the provision that only \$10,000,000 of it should be used for vocational education, the remainder to be used for some type of training under the Department of Labor. Following the protest, which resulted in a restoration of the fund, the House cut the appropriation down a little below the budget estimate.

As I understand, what the distinguished Senator from Illinois is undertaking to do is to cut the appropriation to the amount the House provided. If I misunderstood the Senator, I regret it, but I understood him to say that this appropriation for vocational education was as much as was recommended by the budget, which is not true at all.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Georgia wholly misunderstood the Senator from Oregon. The statement of the Senator from Oregon was that the Bureau had told the House it intended to take one-half of the amount of the budget recommendation, which was \$20,017,760, and divert it from regular vocational education into special training in the defense scene, and that the House refused to accept that type of division or distribution, and insisted on the full amount for the purposes of the George-Barden Act with reference to vocational education.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. The rejection by the House represented a reduction of the grant which had been justified for vocational education in the so-called distributive industries. In my opinion, in this day and in this emergency, we could eliminate that particular segment of vocational education without serious detriment to the economy. I shall, therefore support the Senator from Illinois in his amendment. The Senator from Georgia misunderstood my statement.

Mr. GEORGE. It is the privilege of the Senator from Oregon to support the distinguished Senator from Illinois in his amendment, but we are asked to change the law of the land through an appropriation bill, which the Senate should not be permitted to do, because the act itself authorizes vocational education in agriculture, in mechanics, and in distributive industry.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that through an appropriation bill, through practically every appropriation bill which comes to the floor, by limitation, in most instances by language written by the House, Congress has varied temporarily the application of substantive law in order to work the will of Congress in attempting to stay within its ability to pay?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon has had vastly more experience in this body than I have had. However, I know what the answer would be, namely, that Congress has very frequently been convinced that if it did not do that it would lose all ability to vary appropriations according to conditions. What we now have is a tremendous Federal budget not originally contemplated when the act was passed. The Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Illinois are trying to lighten the burden of the ship as it struggles through the heavy storm.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me point out that in all the debate so far there has been no attack made on this program—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I only refrained from it because of politeness.

Mr. STENNIS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I point out that no attack is being made on the program. It should be permitted to stand on its merits. I cannot understand why a program which is so important, and which has received so much praise and so little criticism as has the vocational education program, should have this trouble every year. The appropriation pertains to a very small part of the program under the George-Barden Act. It is a part of the program which will affect my State. I am interested in the program primarily because vocational education includes agriculture and home economics. I have ascertained that a very fine phase of the program has been developed.

The amount involved is only \$1,794,499, and that is to be distributed among 48 States and 3 Territories. It is the smallest part of the entire program. I think the amendment in the first instance was designed as an attack on that part of the program, because it originally provided that no part of the appropriation should be available for vocational education in distributive occupations. I understand the Senator has

now abandoned that restrictive part of his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Mississippi perhaps did not hear the amendment as it was read. It involves merely a reduction in the total. With respect to training in selling ribbons and groceries, I do not think that is a proper use of Federal funds at the present time. While I am for the welfare state under certain conditions, I do not think that is the most economical way for us to effect that purpose.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am yielding to the Senator from Mississippi, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. STENNIS. Under the present rules the only way a Senator may have an opportunity to speak while another Senator has the floor is to have him yield. That is why I am interrupting the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment originally provided that no part of this money, it makes no difference how much or how little, should be used in connection with the distributive program. So I say a great deal of the attack is made upon that phase of the program which falls under the George-Barden Act.

I submit the proof shows that the program is worth while. It is small, it is true, but it is serving a very good purpose. For the benefit of those who happen not to be familiar with it, it operates to place high-school students, while they are still in school, in some kind of employment within large cities, particularly in small businesses that do not have the means or the funds to provide their own training schools. Every spring thousands of youngsters come out of high schools and junior colleges who have had no contact with affairs of business and economic life where they reside. The training gives them an opportunity, through the high schools particularly, to find contacts and get the touch and the feel of things. Many of them graduate and begin earning their living within 24 hours after they graduate.

I apologize for taking so much time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I do not want to be placed in the light of farming out the time to other Senators, and I do not want Senators to be restricted in their speeches. I merely reply to the Senator from Mississippi, and then I shall yield the floor on this point with the hope that we can proceed to a vote.

We are in a very grave situation. We are facing a deficit of \$5,000,000,000, even if we pass a \$7,500,000,000 tax bill. We have scrutinized each item to see whether, in view of the impending deficit, we should spend the amounts of money requested. We are asked to appropriate approximately \$20,000,000, of which \$1,800,000 is for distributive education. What is distributive education? It is the training of salesgirls and salesmen to sell more effectively ribbons, dry goods, groceries, and so forth.

I submit that so far as high-school students are concerned, it would be much better to train them in composi-

tion, arithmetic, penmanship, health, and kindred subjects. A general education would prepare them better than a lot of useless courses in selling. There is nothing that has given us a cheaper standard than has this emphasis upon selling. It would be much better if we were more expert with our hands, could raise crops more effectively, could make things more effectively, instead of trying to put something over on the next fellow. I know it will be said that distributive education does more than that, but we can protect ourselves against the source of cheapening of American life if we reduce the emphasis upon selling.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. SALTONSTALL addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have concluded, and I think I should yield the floor and let other Senators speak in their own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I desire to answer the Senator from Illinois. It is very fine to have published in some great metropolitan newspaper that we are saving millions of dollars. I hope the Senator from Illinois will listen to testimony given before the subcommittee which I propose to read. Will my good friend from Illinois listen to the testimony of a young high-school girl, an average American girl? Possibly it was not published in any of the metropolitan newspapers of Illinois. I am speaking now of testimony submitted before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations by a young high-school girl, not interested in the social state, not interested in communism, but a typical, average, country girl from the South. I read the statement of Miss Nellie Towns, office manager, Wyatts', Inc., of Rome, Ga. She was introduced by Mr. H. F. George, son and administrative assistant of the senior Senator from Georgia.

I shall read the statement of this young lady from Rome, Ga., so the Senator from Illinois will realize that we are not looking for the social state, but have in mind affording opportunities for American young people:

STATEMENT OF MISS NELLIE TOWNS, OFFICE MANAGER, WYATTS', INC., ROME, GA.

Senator CHAVEZ. Would you care to read your statement for the record?

Miss TOWNS. Yes, I shall be glad to do so.

Senator CHAVEZ. You sit down there by Senator HUMPHREY and give him a break.

Senator HUMPHREY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator CHAVEZ. You may proceed in your own way. We are very informal here.

This is a young lady who represents a cross-section of fine young American people.

Miss TOWNS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is Nellie Towns, of Rome, Ga.

I am a graduate of the Rome High School. I received vocational training in one of the many distributive occupations.

I appear here to plead with you to restore this phase of vocational education to the

appropriation bill, H. R. 3709, and the funds which are necessary if the program is to be continued. I am here representing the thousands of former distributive education students to whom this program has meant so much.

In the fall of 1946 I went to see Miss Frances Beal, coordinator of distributive education in my school, about enrolling in this phase of vocational education. I had worked that summer at McLellan's Variety Store, and through this experience, knew that I wanted to prepare to stay in the distributive field.

My father, an employee of the Rome Hosiery Mill—

He was one of the run-of-the-mine citizens, as one may say, a man trying to earn a living in Georgia, trying to contribute his life in order to be of some service to his fellow men and to society.

My father, an employee of the Rome Hosiery Mill, was having difficulty in meeting the increased cost of living.

Is that not grand? This little young lady was trying to take advantage of a program which was authorized by her Congress, in order to help her father, who was having difficulty in meeting his family obligations.

And I felt that, through this part-time school and work plan I could not only assure myself of an education but also help to defray my own expenses and at the same time prepare myself for earning a—

What?—

a living.

So that she would not be a charge upon society, so that she could be self-sufficient, and contribute her share to the American way of life.

There was one store in Rome in particular in which I wanted to work—Wyatts', Inc. This is a specialty store which sells gifts, silver, china—

The Senator from Illinois appears to be rather ill at ease because a young girl dares to sell her labor, and that labor may perhaps be selling a gift which might go to a girl who is going to be married. What is there embarrassing about that? The merchants of this country have made the country by contributing their salesmanship, yes, even in gift shops, and in selling ribbons. I know of girls, honest and reliable, who possibly have contributed as much as any others to womanhood and to motherhood—perhaps some of them are the mothers of soldiers who are dying in Korea—who were in the distributing business, working, yes, for Kahns and for Epsteins and other merchants throughout the country. It was commerce and trade that made the country what it was in the old days in New England, and that in the Southwest, my own section of the country, contributed heavily to the winning of the West.

During my senior year I received training in several of the store departments, including some office work within this retail store.

What was she doing? Was she asking Uncle Sam for the social state, or was she only taking advantage of the fact that Congress had passed sound legislation?

I am proud of the fact that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] sponsored the George-Barden Act, which

makes it possible for those who cannot afford to go to the University of Illinois or the University of Chicago, still to go to a little trade school in Rome, Ga., and learn to earn their own living. I think we had better take care of the sticks, as it were. We had better take care of the descendants of the pioneer mothers; yes, even in selling ribbons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not on the subject of selling ribbons.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When I had the floor I yielded to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think it is just as honorable to sell ribbons as it is to teach in the University of Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand the Senator from New Mexico to say that my amendment is against motherhood?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know what I would understand as to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois in that respect.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] addressed the young lady. He said:

You spoke of your good father. What work does he do in the mill?

In the mill, not in a university, not in a bank, not in a big industrial plant. He was working in a mill in Georgia.

Miss TOWNS. He is a watchman at the mill. Senator HILL. How far is it from the Alabama line?

Miss TOWNS. Not very far. Senator HILL. You speak like an Alabamian, and that is enough for me.

Senator THYE—

The Senator from Minnesota, as fine a citizen as ever contributed to the wisdom—or otherwise—of this body, represented the minority side.

Senator THYE. Mr. Chairman, the best recommendation that could possibly be made for the full appropriation is what this young lady has just said.

Senator CHAVEZ. She is very convincing.

Miss TOWNS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I could read from the testimony of a little country girl living in West Virginia—not the type whose father could afford to spend \$3,000 to send her to a great finishing school, but the kind who is doing what the average person does, namely, meeting the circumstances of the moment in an American way. This little girl is from Clay, W. Va.—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think the Senator might well bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that Miss Nellie Towns, the young lady from Rome, Ga., whom he has been quoting, finished the distributive-education course in a local high school. She worked in the office for 1 year. The next year she was promoted to the position of assistant office manager, and the following year she became manager of the office. Does the Senator think that if that young lady had not had the advantages of this training and the benefits which accrued to her under the George-Barden Act, she could ever have made the progress she did and become what she has become?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was the only opportunity she had to advance. Her father was not in a position to send her to the University of Georgia. Her father was not in a position to send her to any university, so she did the next best thing. In olden days one would become an apprentice—perhaps to a plumber, a carpenter, a butcher, or someone in some other trade. Through work, and by reason of help and cooperation, and being allowed the opportunity to improve herself, this young lady has advanced without the necessity of the social state taking care of her.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I think no one could have heard this little lady testify without being impressed. I believe no one could have seen her on the stand and heard her words and noted her speech and attitude, and had the opportunity to make an estimate of her character and her fine citizenship without being impressed with the thought that she must have fine parents.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. That thought came to me as she testified. I asked her what work her father was engaged in. She replied that he was a watchman at the mill. How much better was her position as manager of the office than the position of watchman. I could not help but feel that the father had not had this opportunity. There was no vocational education when her father was coming along. There was no opportunity for him to train and educate and prepare himself to be the manager of the office, whereas this young lady had such an opportunity and took advantage of it. She became, not a watchman at the plant, but the office manager of the plant.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The case of the girl which the Senator has recited is reflected over and over again in my mail. During the consideration of the bill I received many letters from buyers in department stores, specialty shops, and ready-to-wear shops. They were letters from girls who were then enjoying high incomes because of this training. They gave full credit to this training program for their progress.

I cannot see that this is merely a program designed to help someone sell ribbons. There are three branches to our production in this country, namely, agriculture, industry, and distribution. Unless we have a distributive industry, the other two branches can go sour when times become a little bad.

About 90 percent of the little businesses in the small towns in the State of Oklahoma—and I am sure the same situation must prevail in Illinois and in other States—are in the retail trade. What chance does a boy or girl have to find a future better than that of being a day laborer unless he is given an opportunity to improve his vocational education through the distributive trades?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was the philosophy behind the George-Barden Act.

Mr. MONRONEY. Exactly so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The purpose was to afford an opportunity to those who, under our economic system, would not otherwise have had the opportunity.

Mr. MONRONEY. The States must appreciate this program, because they must spend more than \$2 of their own money for every dollar of Federal funds they use. If we strike out the appropriation of Federal funds, we invite the States to discontinue the program. They must feel that it is a good program. They are close to it. They have seen the progress which has been made. I cannot help but feel that we shall be bettering industry and bettering the opportunities of boys and girls to work their way through high school if we continue this program, which was continued throughout World War II.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I do not appeal to the galleries, but the visitors in the galleries represent a fine cross-section of the American people. I want to tell them the story of another little girl who, without the George-Barden legislation, would not have been able to appear before the committee. This is the statement of Miss Patsy Ann Reed, of Clay, W. Va. I read from page 1145 of the record of the hearings:

Senator CHAVEZ. We have present here a young lady from West Virginia. We would like to hear from Miss Patsy Ann Reed.

Miss Reed.

Miss REED. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Patsy Ann Reed, of Clay, W. Va.

I am a junior in the Clay High School. I have had 2 years of home economics and I plan to take a third year next school term.

I am proud to have been chosen to appear before this group as a representative of home economics. We appreciate very much your giving us the time to tell you something about our program.

She was speaking from the heart. She did not have a prepared statement.

West Virginia has a good program in home economics, and I feel that when I give you a picture of our goals and accomplishments, I will be showing you a vital growing family-life program which groups all over the United States are attempting to follow.

I attend a school where our home-economics teachers have had training which qualified them for vocational work.

Here home economics is not just cooking and sewing. It is the study of everything that pertains to the home and family, including all phases of food, clothing, home improvements, finance, and consumer education for better and happier living.

She has saved money for the family by being able to take advantage of the program.

Mr. President, I have been in the Congress for 20 years. There is not a better program for liberty-loving people than vocational training for our youngsters who cannot afford to go to school. I recommend this program to those who would sermonize to the entire world about freedom.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there are a couple of amendments with respect to which I shall have to move to suspend the rule, because they are partly of a legislative nature. One applies to the Freedman's Hospital and the other applies to the Medical Center.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico wish to offer an amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes by which the amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time will be reconsidered, in order that the Senator from New Mexico may offer an amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Illinois for that purpose?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be offered in spite of the fact that the bill has been read the third time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was called off the floor for a few minutes. Do I correctly understand that the bill was passed in my absence?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have some more amendments which I should like to offer. Will they be in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order for the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill has been reconsidered by unanimous consent. Therefore the Senator's amendments will be in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. They will be in order. I thank the Chair.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may the clerk now read the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 27, after "\$250,000" in line 19, it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided, That the Surgeon General is authorized, on such terms and conditions as he determines are appropriate for the efficient operation of the combined hospital and research building, to lease for a total of not more than 99 years a portion of the present site of the National Institutes of Health for the construction, operation, and maintenance thereon by the lessee of rental quarters but not to exceed 250 units limited exclusively to oc-

cupancy by employees of the National Institutes of Health and necessary related facilities, such quarters and facilities to be constructed and operated without regard to local zoning limitations, but to be subject for the term of the lease to State and local taxation on the same basis as other property in the community: *Provided further*, That not more than \$50,000 of the amounts heretofore appropriated for the construction of additional auxiliary structures under this head shall be available for expenditure by the Public Health Service for the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction on the property leased pursuant to the preceding provision, such expenditure to be repaid by the lessee and credited to such appropriation."

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should first like to explain the purpose of the amendment before I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Some time ago Congress passed what is known as the Wherry law, providing for the construction of housing units around Government reservations. At the medical center in Bethesda, Md., it is sought to construct some housing units to serve the employees of the medical center. The pending amendment would prohibit the appropriation of money for the construction of such housing, but would allow the superintendent of the institution to lease a certain area to private capital, which in turn would build the units under the Wherry Act. It would not cost the Government one penny in appropriations for the construction of the housing units, because they would be constructed by private enterprise. They would not come in competition with the outside because they could only be rented to persons who are employed at the medical center.

I have had some consultations with very fine citizens of Montgomery County, the area which is so ably represented by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. It was at their suggestion that the amendment was drawn with the provision that the property could not be rented except to persons who are employed by the medical center, so as not to compete with outside interests.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like first to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I shall make a point of order with reference to the Senator's amendment when he has finished with his statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I knew it would be subject to a point of order. That is why I gave notice of a motion to suspend the rules for the presentation of the amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator whether I am correct in understanding that an appropriation for such construction has been made, but that it has been frozen by the Bureau

of the Budget pending the passage of the pending amendment? Am I correct in my understanding?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly some of the appropriation has been frozen. It could not be used for such purpose under the pending amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the pending amendment is not agreed to, will not that appropriation be used? If so, if the pending amendment is not agreed to, would it not cost the Government more money? The houses would be built anyway, would they not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But they would be built with Government money?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. The purpose of offering the pending amendment is to keep Government money from being used for that purpose. The construction would not cost the Government anything under the pending amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the pending amendment is ruled out on a point of order, the necessary housing would cost the Government money, would it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. The money is available and, of necessity, the housing will be constructed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. HILL. In other words, the housing must be constructed for the use of the Government employees of the medical center, and Congress has recognized that fact by authorizing the construction and appropriating certain funds for it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. HILL. However, the committee in its wisdom—and I think it is acting wisely—instead of providing for the use of the money already appropriated and appropriating additional funds, sees fit to have the housing built under the Wherry Act, which would mean that the housing would be constructed at no cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The housing will be built anyway, because it is necessary. However, if the point of order is sustained, and the amendment is ruled out of order, it would cost the Government money to build the houses, which would not be the case if the amendment were to prevail and the houses were built by private capital.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; and they would not compete in any way with housing outside the reservation. The statement made to me by the good citizens of the Bethesda area of Montgomery County in Maryland is to the effect that they do not wish the housing project to be constructed and then used for rental purposes by persons outside the reservation.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not correct that if the housing is built by private interests, the Government will

have to make allowances to the persons who will be housed in it, for the purpose of paying their rental?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, they would have to pay a rental. However, they would be dealing with the men who leased the property.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not correct that it would cost the Government more money by the employment of that method than it would if the Government built the housing?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; because they would not deal with the Government at all. Constructor A gets a 99-year lease from the Superintendent of the Medical Center. He says, "I want to build 250 units. I want to rent them to the employees." He would then deal with the employees. The man who held the lease would be the man who had spent his money in constructing the housing.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is correct, but the persons who would occupy the housing would be uniformed personnel of the military service.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I presume that is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If they do not live in Government-owned property the Public Health Service must give them an allowance for rent. If a computation were made it would be found that employing the proposed method would cost the Government more money than if the Government were to build the apartments and house such personnel in them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we thought we were carrying out the intent of the Government when we passed the Wherry Act.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. As I understand, the Wherry Act deals primarily with housing at military reservations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Where there was no ready market for the housing and where the reservation was likely to be deactivated at any time. For those reasons it was felt that Federal funds could appropriately be used for construction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to make a statement with reference to this subject for the information of the Senate.

The National Institutes of Health are located in Bethesda, Md. The Bethesda-Chevy Chase district of Maryland is one of the finest residential districts in Montgomery County, and is one of the very finest residential districts in the State of Maryland. It has become such, not by accident, but by reason of careful planning and zoning; and the people of that area have labored for years to keep out of it such construction as that now proposed by means of this amendment.

If the Government of the United States, which now has sufficient funds for this purpose—for the appropriation was made last year, in last year's appropriation bill—constructs the building on the Government reservation with the money now available, there will be no possibility of having some private interest say at a later time, "We have a right

to build private apartment houses in this fine residential area because so and so did it on the Government reservation."

If we permit this to be done, we shall very seriously impair, if not render useless, all the work which has been done by the people of this community, which embraces approximately 3,000 homes; we shall set all their work at naught at one fell swoop, simply because we want to have the building constructed by private interests, rather than by a Government agency, for which the funds already are available.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I appreciate the position of the Senator from Maryland. I know he is a most conscientious member of this body.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I do not wish to see an apartment building erected in a residential neighborhood and make it impossible to maintain one of the finest residential districts in Maryland.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have known Montgomery County for more than 30 years; I have known it under different circumstances. The good people of that community suggested, not the original amendment reported by the committee, but the amendment as submitted by the chairman of the subcommittee at this time. It was not the chairman of the subcommittee or the committee itself who drew up the last amendment. Five persons from the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area are trying to do the very thing the Senator from Maryland has in mind. They want to prevent this property from being rented to persons who are not connected with the reservation, and they want to make the property subject to rental only by employees of the Medical Center.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The question is a little deeper than that. In the first place, they want to have the structure—regardless of who builds it—limited to occupancy by persons connected with the National Institutes of Health.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. They also have a deeper consideration. As I have said, for years they have carefully watched this property and have maintained it as a fine residential neighborhood. They have fought every application to erect apartment houses in that area; they have done everything they could to keep that type of construction out of that part of Maryland. If private interests build this apartment house on the Government property—and I may say that in the amendment the provision is not specific; the apartment house could be built anywhere in the reservation—then the people of the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area will have no defense whatever against further encroachment, and that is their chief concern.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does my good friend, the Senator from Maryland, think for one moment that, after the Government

has spent millions and millions of dollars on buildings within that area, it now would give a lease to a private concern to build any kind of construction which would be detrimental to the property across the street?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is not a question of the building which is proposed to be constructed. If the building now proposed to be constructed is built under private auspices, then the people of that district will never be able to say to another private interest, "You cannot do the same thing across the street," for in that case all their defense to protect the neighborhood would be taken from them.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Then the Senator from Maryland is inconsistent, because he now takes the position that in order to obtain that construction, the committee should recommend the making of a Federal Government appropriation, whereas we are trying to avoid doing that.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The committee does not have to recommend it. The appropriation was made in last year's appropriation bill, and it is now available.

Mr. President, I submit that this matter should be returned to the committee for further study. This is an important question. In my brief experience in this body, I have heard the statement made many times that we should not legislate on this floor. However, that is exactly what we shall be doing in this case, and we shall be hurting a large number of persons, and we will be jeopardizing a large investment in a very fine neighborhood.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland whether in line 10 of the amendment, at the bottom of the page—

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have not seen the amendment. Will the Senator read it?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read from line 10, in which we find the words: "without regard to local zoning limitations."

If those words are stricken out, would not that cover the point the Senator from Maryland has in mind?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Even if those words are eliminated, we still have the basic proposition of permitting private interests to build in a very restricted neighborhood, in violation of existing zoning laws, a structure that is undesirable to those who live in that residential area.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; I say that if the words "without regard to local zoning limitations" are stricken out, the building will have to be erected subject to the local zoning laws.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Then the building could not be constructed, because the local zoning laws do not permit the construction of such a building.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly there is housing construction around the naval clinic.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There is Government-owned construction there,

and of course we have no control over it. Unfortunately, the Government of the United States constructs what it wishes to construct, without any regard for the local zoning laws. That is what we are fighting against in this case.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The committee was under the impression that we were trying to agree with the philosophy of the Senator from Maryland. First it is said that the residents of that area do not want the Government to interfere in Montgomery County or in any other county.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I have not said that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And then one of the committees of the Senate says, "All right; we will not vote to allow them a dime, but we shall permit them to build under the Wherry Act."

Let me say that the Montgomery County Council has no objection, and has so stated to the committee. The president of the chamber of commerce made no objection before the committee.

We wish to protect the rights of the fine people of Montgomery County. I want to do exactly what the Senator from Maryland wants to do in the way of protecting them, after they have built up a very fine community during the last 20 or 30 years. They should be protected.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico cannot do that by pressing for the adoption of his present amendment, because it goes to the very heart of the zoning in that area. If we permit private interests to erect such a building on a location in Bethesda, it will not be possible at a later time to say to other private interests, "You cannot do the same thing."

In other words, the adoption of this amendment would result in setting completely at naught all the accomplishments which have been made in that fine community.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the citizens of that area want the appropriation made, that is all right with me; but do not let it be said that the committee did not try to save the taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I should like to read a letter dated May 22, 1951, addressed to Mr. W. H. Sebrell, Jr., Director of the National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Md. That letter reads as follows:

Dear Mr. SEBRELL: County Manager Irving G. McNayr—

I assume that he speaks for at least some segment of the populace of Montgomery County, and presumably he speaks for the majority—

called your letter of today's date to the attention of the county committee this morning.

I assume that the county committee is a legal entity of Montgomery County. I read further from the letter:

The council authorized me to inform you that the language which is proposed for the National Institutes of Health, 1952 appropriations, is not objectionable to the council, but we do wish to point out that we are concerned with the lack of county control over the actual zoning for apartment

use on these federally owned properties. We recognize that any objection on our part would be ineffective in this instance, but it should be understood that any action by the Institutes of Public Health in providing apartment facilities on this federally owned property will not be considered by the county council as setting a precedent for private development of this type in the county areas adjacent to the National Institutes of Public Health.

They do not object to the building within the reservation, but they do not want to feel that a precedent is being established with respect to the adjacent property; and I fully agree with them.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. But that is what it would amount to, when this is done. The act speaks for itself.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The letter is signed by J. Louis Monarch, president of the County Council of Montgomery County, Md. I presume the council represents more than a few people.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator have a letter dated June 8 from the Maplewood Citizens Association, signed by William J. Barnhard, president, and also a letter dated June 7, 1951, from the Oakmont Citizens Association, signed by William L. Daley, chairman?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have a letter dated June 8 from the Maplewood Citizens Association, Bethesda, Md. It is signed by Mr. Barnhard.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That letter is from an association representing 2,500 families in the Bethesda-Chevy Chase area. It is a very substantial part of that whole community. They very seriously object to this proposal. It seems to me that this question could be studied further by the committee, and that the people of the area who would be affected should be given consideration. This proposed legislation should go to the committee to be thoroughly studied and then brought to the floor of the Senate, so that everyone could have an opportunity of knowing what is proposed to be done in this fine community.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there is nothing unreasonable about the request of the Senator from Maryland, in the opinion of the chairman of the subcommittee. The only thing is that it will be necessary immediately to begin construction of some type in order to carry on the work of the medical center.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. That is perfectly true, but the money is available and a start can be made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; that is not correct. Under this bill, we rescinded the money item, because we wanted the construction to be handled by private enterprise.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If it goes back to the committee, the committee can meet within 2 or 3 days to authorize the money, and the building can start.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I should like to go through with this bill, and at least take it to conference to see whether the conferees are able to get together.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator from Maryland realizes that the Senator from New Mexico wishes to try that, but in this instance 2,300 or 2,500

families who have investments in their homes feel that this proposal would very seriously injure property in their vicinity. I think the committee of the Senate should study the situation and should give heed to what these people are saying.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The committee of the Senate has studied it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I did not so understand.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We certainly did.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I understood that this was not a committee amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We heard the testimony. The convincing argument on behalf of the proposed amendment is the fact that we are not appropriating any of the money of the taxpayers of Montgomery County. We are not taking one penny away from any Montgomery County taxpayer, but we are going to use private enterprise, as suggested by many of my friends on the other side of the aisle, in order to keep away from Government expenditure, and to let private enterprise act in the normal way. We agree with that philosophy. All of a sudden someone says, "No; it is wrong; let the Government appropriate." All I say is that the construction is needed. It is immaterial to me whether it is constructed by private enterprise or by the Government.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No Member of this body has a keener sense of duty and obligation to save the money of the taxpayers than has the Senator from Maryland, but I do not feel that this method is going to save the taxpayers any money. I think it is going to cost them more, because, as I pointed out to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, if this building is constructed under private auspices then the Public Health Service will have to allocate the money for the purpose of paying the rentals of those who occupy the apartment house. Nothing is said about what the rent will be or about what the terms of the leases will be. There is nothing in this amendment which resembles the Wherry Act. I think it must go back to the committee for further study, in order that there may be a determination of what is the best thing to do. I do not think we are in a position to act on it at this time.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield, let me say to the Senator from Maryland that not all the employees by any means who are to occupy these apartments will be commissioned personnel drawing allowances for rental. Much of this personnel will comprise nurses under the civil service. There will be maintenance people, chief engineers, custodians, and all sorts of persons who will draw no rental allowance whatever.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. There are bills now pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service providing for giving such persons allowances to pay for the very rentals of which my friend is speaking.

Mr. HILL. There are thousands of bills, but the fact that someone has introduced a bill does not mean that it will be passed, by any means.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Especially in view of the action taken by the Senate as to the pending bill.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. We do not know how many persons will be affected by it if the amendment should become law, but we do know that a vast majority of the persons who will occupy the building will receive allowances with which to pay rent.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. With all due respect to my good friend from Maryland, when he speaks of a vast majority, the Senator is in error. I say that with great respect for the esteemed Senator. Much of the personnel is not commissioned personnel at all. They will receive no allowance for rental. Many of them do not come in the category of commissioned personnel.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Has the Senator from New Mexico any figures showing what the cost will be?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We have some figures which will give an idea to the Senator from Maryland. Here is a letter dated May 16, 1951, under the heading "Construction of housing for the Clinical Center at the National Institutes of Health." I read:

When the Clinical Center is in operation at Bethesda, it will be essential for certain personnel to be housed at the National Institute of Health in order to be available for emergencies. These would be medical and nursing personnel and certain others in the administrative and plant operation areas.

It was those persons whom the Senator from Alabama had in mind.

The total number of personnel who will receive housing on the NIH Reservation is approximately 250. Two methods have been under consideration as a means of providing the necessary housing, namely, Government or private construction, or a combination of both.

The Congress appropriated \$1,105,000 in funds and contract authorization in 1951, an amount sufficient for Government construction of an estimated 60 units, at least two-thirds of which were efficiency units. The funds for this project have been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget, pending the outcome of attempts to secure all or part of the 250 total units through private construction.

If the 60 units of Government housing were provided, the annual estimated expenses for operating the building would be \$58,000.

If the Government were to appropriate the money and to construct the building, the expense for operating the building alone would be \$58,000.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator have any figures indicating how much money the Government would save by not having to give grants to personnel who would be entitled to them if they lived in private housing?

Mr. CHAVEZ. To quote again from the letter:

These would be medical and nursing personnel and certain others in the administrative and plant operation areas.

Medical personnel might receive a grant or an allowance for housing, but nurses would not. The personnel would

include the superintendent, the man who feeds the oil into the boiler, the scrub-woman who cleans the floors. None of those persons have any allowances. The only persons who would receive allowances would be officers in the medical personnel. The stenographers and the clerks who keep the records would not receive a penny of allowance.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The Senator has no information, has he, as to how much the Government would have to pay if these people lived in private housing, over what they would have to pay in public housing which would be provided under the original appropriation?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, I do not. But the private housing would have the advantage that the personnel would be dealing individually with the men who had the lease. The Government would not be involved at all.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. But if they were military personnel the Government would have to give them an allowance, would it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Employee A would go before leaseholder B and say, "I want to rent this property which you have constructed." They would be dealing with each other.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Much has been said about the Wherry Act, and I should like to explain what the Wherry Act actually does. It does permit the erection of private buildings on public property where a lease is given, under certain terms and conditions. In the Military Establishment those conditions provide what the rental shall be, and who is to rent the buildings, and the occupants pay the rent out of their own pockets. There is no donation of rent to anyone, and I do not think it is intended here. I do not know what the basis for the proposed legislation is, but the rental will have to be accounted for between the Government employee and the lessee who builds a private-enterprise project. Is not that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The language is clear, and the Senator can put on it any interpretation he thinks it merits. It provides that the Surgeon General is authorized, under such terms and conditions as he determines are appropriate for the efficient operation of the combined hospital and research building, to lease for a total of not more than 99 years a portion of the present site of the National Institutes of Health for construction, operation, and maintenance thereon by the lessee of rental quarters and related facilities, such quarters and facilities to be constructed and operated without regard to the local zoning limitation, but to be subject for the term of the lease to State and local taxes on the same basis as any other property in the community.

That is the difference between what happens under the amendment submitted by the committee and construction by the Federal Government. If the building is constructed by the Federal Government, the State of Maryland will not receive one penny in taxes; while if

the land is leased to a private enterprise which constructs a housing unit on it, the State of Maryland and the county of Montgomery can collect taxes.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the principal theory of the Wherry Act. But who is going to finance these dwellings? In the case of a military installation, there would be available Government money and Government insurance.

Mr. CHAVEZ. A contractor of Bethesda can go to his banker in Baltimore and say "I am going to construct a building," and he can borrow money. He could possibly apply to the Federal Government.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the point. We go along nicely until we reach that point. I know of no provision whereby one can get Government money for the building of a hospital. It can be done for the building of a military installation, if it is to be insured by the Government.

Mr. HILL. Let me say that all the war housing has not been constructed on Government-owned land.

Mr. WHERRY. That is not the point. Nine-tenths of it has been. The program was started because there was a desire to build installations on military property where it was not desirable for private enterprise to build because there was no permanency of the lease, and there is no permanency of the military installation. The program was started on that basis. It has now been expanded to include buildings near or adjacent to military installations. In fact, the general housing bill, as it was passed by the Senate, expanded the provision to include atomic energy projects. While it is true that the provision has been expanded, yet in all such cases it is my feeling that Government financing is required, as well as Government insurance. My question is: Is it intended that private enterprise shall be able to obtain Government money, or does it have to depend on private money? That would make a little difference.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The intent is to finance the project as any Wherry Act project would be financed.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Government insure the project if it builds it?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The purpose of the amendment is to have the activity come within the Wherry philosophy.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes, but if the project is built by private enterprise, with private money, will the Government insure the loan up to the requirement?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Government will insure through FHA.

Mr. WHERRY. Are such builders receiving Government insurance now?

Mr. HILL. It has not been started yet. The proposal is to permit the building of this particular project.

Mr. WHERRY. I agree with the proposed legislation, but there is a limit on insurance.

Mr. HILL. I think the provision is absolutely four-square with the Wherry Act.

Mr. WHERRY. It cannot come under the Wherry Act.

Mr. HILL. Yes, on the same conditions exactly as other loans come under the Wherry Act.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I am making is that they are not entitled to it at this time. Until such authorization is given as was given with respect to atomic energy projects, I do not see how the project could operate unless Government insurance were obtained. I am for the building of houses according to the principles of the Wherry Act. I believe those principles should be applied if it is possible to do so. I appreciate what the Senator from New Mexico is trying to do, but we should not pass a piece of legislation on the understanding or theory that it comes within the provisions of the Wherry Act, when it does not. That is the point I am making.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We think it does come within those provisions.

Mr. WHERRY. In this case provision is made for a 99-year lease. I think the longest lease FHA made provision for under the Wherry Act was not to exceed 35 years. In my opinion the proposal does not comply with FHA provisions. That is the point I make now. Has the question been cleared so it is certain Government insurance can be obtained under the Senator's proposal? It is broader than others.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes it can. We made provision of a lease for 99 years. A contractor may in the best of faith desire to make a lease, for which he will be obligated, and on which he will probably have to give a bond.

Mr. WHERRY. That is not the point.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me finish my statement. In that respect he goes further than is provided under the Wherry Act. If, under the Wherry Act, a contractor constructs a project on the new reservation at Paducah, Ky., are there any provisions under which the State of Kentucky can collect taxes on that project?

Mr. WHERRY. That is not the question. The question is, Can a man, under this authorization, build a project for this hospital which meets the requirement of FHA with respect to insurance of the loan? That is the point I am making. For example, provision is made in the Senator's approval for a 99-year lease. In my opinion FHA has never sanctioned any such thing under the Wherry Act.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The proponents of the proposed legislation think everything they have in mind will be done.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that, while I am in complete sympathy with his proposal, personally, so far as zoning is concerned, I do not see any difference between the Government building a hospital, or a building for research, on Government property, and a private enterpriser building on the same property. I do not understand the point made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. If it can be done in the one case it seems to me it can be done in the other, so far as zoning is concerned.

I do not want to go into that subject, however, because I did not hear the testi-

mony, and I do not know the issues involved. But I wish to say that if the project is built by private enterprise, under the principle involved in the Wherry Act, which, when it was passed, applied to military installations, it would not cost the Government any money. It would be built under such conditions that the lessee would secure rent from everyone who lived in the building. Insurance can be obtained on the project provided it meets the specifications and requirements of FHA, and the project eventually reverts back to the Government at the end of the period.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The issues are simple. Either the houses are built with private funds or with Government funds.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am obliged to depend upon the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee for information on this subject. If the requirements can be met, very well, but unless they can be met, it seems to me FHA could refuse to participate in any way in the transaction.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I call for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for by the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from New Mexico can yield only for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The most interested party, so far as the Government is concerned, is the Public Health Service. The Public Health Service, after consultation with its neighbors in Bethesda and with others, came before the committee and testified that what we have proposed is the way to meet the requirements of the moment. It is necessary that there be housing built for those who are going to work there. The committee was completely satisfied that the work could be done, as proposed by the amendment, without Congress having to make an appropriation to carry out the purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the Senator from New Mexico willing to modify his amendment in the tenth line on the first page, by striking out, in the third word, the three letters "o-u-t," so that the last line would read "and operated with regard to local zoning limitations."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Striking out "out"?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So as to leave the word "with"?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So the language would be "with regard to local zoning limitations"?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, no one would object to the local zoning laws applying. I would be willing to take that modification to conference, and in conference call in the good citizens of Montgomery County. But I should like to say that we should proceed and try to obtain some housing, because it is badly needed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If those three letters are stricken out, then in justice to the position of the Senator from Maryland the conferees would have to provide that the building would be subject to the local zoning laws or strike out the whole provision, unless it could be amended so as to make it properly applicable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Massachusetts knows the Senator from New Mexico well enough to be sure that if this body agrees to a proposition he, as chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate, will certainly try to carry out what the Senate of the United States has in mind.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland if that would not cover the objection he has made.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I feel that it would.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then I should like to offer an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, to strike out the three letters "o-u-t" in the last line of the first page of the amendment, so the word "with" would remain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the motion to suspend the rule for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been demanded.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rule be suspended in order that I may submit the amendment as modified by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I object. I insist upon the regular order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Would not the Senator from New Mexico be able, under the Senate rules, to modify his own amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not yet before the Senate. It can come before the Senate only if the rule is suspended.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact that if this building is constructed by private enterprise, it will be a project of some \$3,000,000, and the \$3,000,000 project will be subject to taxation in the State of Maryland?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is true.

Mr. HILL. Is it not a fact also that if the language is not just as it should be, to make sure that the FHA will provide the necessary insurance for the loan, when the bill goes to conference suitable language can be worked out there?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor, and the Senator from Alabama was asking him a question.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I did not think it was quite a question.

Mr. HILL. Certainly it was a question.

Is it not a fact that the language can be modified in conference if there is any question as to whether or not it does what we seek to do so far as bringing this project under the Wherry Act is concerned, with the help of the FHA?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is not only a fact but it is a stern reality.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. As I stated a moment ago, I am perfectly willing to support the amendment, but in supporting it I do not want it understood that the language which is adopted will remain as a Senate amendment, because it cannot remain in the form proposed if the project is to qualify under the Wherry Act. We should not mislead those who desire to erect this building.

To begin with, there is no provision anywhere that I know of under which the FHA provides insurance in the case of a lease which runs longer than 35 years. I want to be perfectly frank. I believe that this is the way to get the housing. I am for the proposal. I ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, if the provision is taken to conference, to take it to conference as a recommendation for housing, with the understanding that language will be written in conference which is satisfactory to the House conferees and in conformity with the provisions of the Wherry Act.

We have no right to place in an appropriation bill a provision changing all the rules governing the FHA, and changing the period of leases from 35 years to 99 years in order to carry out the provisions of the appropriation bill. That is the point I am making.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I agree with the points made by the Senator from Nebraska. I hope the Senator understands that when we go to conference we will try to arrive at a report which will be satisfactory to both bodies. I know the proprieties. The average Senator knows the proprieties, including parliamentary proprieties.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, why could we not do it in the regular order and let the committee study the question and find out whether the project comes under the FHA, and whether or not it qualifies under the Wherry Act? Figures should be brought before us so that Senators may know what they are voting on. If I have to vote on this amendment, I shall not know what I am voting on.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the rule be suspended in order that the amendment may come before the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to suspend the rule of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the possibility of finishing the consideration of the bill this evening? Is it the desire of the Senator from New Mexico to conclude the consideration of the bill this evening or does he desire to have it go over until tomorrow?

Mr. CHAVEZ. In view of some suggestions which were made by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], to the effect that he would like to consult with some of his constituents in Montgomery County, Md., during the evening, perhaps it would be better to postpone final action until tomorrow. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has some further amendments to propose to the bill. Perhaps it would be possible to enter into a unanimous consent agreement with reference to a limitation of time.

Mr. WHERRY. I am assured by the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] that he has no objection to taking almost immediate action on the bill. He would like to make a statement after he discusses the subject with his constituents, but he has no objection to an expeditious disposition of the bill. At this time I should like to say to the majority leader that there will be no difficulty in completing consideration of the bill tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. It was my intention, if we could make disposition of the pending bill, to announce a call of the calendar tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. That could be done anyway.

Mr. McFARLAND. I should like to have something definite in mind before making such an announcement.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether he will request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two letters, one from the Maplewood Improvement Association and the other from the Oakmont Improvement Association, which have been referred to in the course of my statement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, I shall be glad to do so. I ask unanimous consent to have those letters printed at this point in the RECORD, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAPLEWOOD CITIZENS ASSOCIATION,
Bethesda, Md., June 8, 1951.

Hon. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: The citizens of Bethesda who live in communities adjacent to the National Institutes of Health are much perturbed by your proposal to authorize the Surgeon General to arrange for the private construction and operation of apartments on the Federal reservation. At a meeting this week of civic association leaders representing about 2,500 Bethesda families, it was agreed that the original (and normal) plan to have the hospital construct its own quarters for nurses, house doctors, and other key emergency personnel was much more desirable, for both national and local considerations.

Some of the reasons for our attitude follow:

1. Despite the appearance of a monetary saving to the Federal Government, the proposed plan of private construction and operation will actually cost the Federal taxpayers much more than the cost of constructing the public buildings with public funds. The residents of the housing will be for the most part commissioned personnel of the Public Health Service, who are entitled to a rental allowance if they live in such quarters, but do not receive an allowance if they use public quarters. That allowance, paid out of PHS appropriations, will pay for the amortized cost of the buildings, the operating and maintenance costs, and the operator's profits, an amount totaling considerably more than would the Government's investment in comparable publicly built quarters.

2. Although the proposal appears to be patterned on the provisions of Public Law 211 (the Wherry Act), it contains none of the limitations or restrictions of that law, but gives unrestrained authority to the Surgeon General to make such arrangements as he may see fit. He may contract for the construction of 250,000 units rather than the intended 250; there is no requirement in the original proposal that only hospital personnel may live in the apartments; there is no word in the amendment as to the terms of the lease. Moreover, the Wherry Act was made applicable to military reservations, according to Senate Report 410, "particularly in isolated localities, where the possibility of deactivation or curtailment of the installation is combined with the lack of an independent market for the housing." In Bethesda, there are no such conditions; it is part of a large metropolitan area, there is no possibility of "deactivation or curtailment" of the research hospital, and there is an independent market for housing.

3. It is because of the drastic effect of this proposal on the well-developed communities adjacent to the NIH that the citizens of Bethesda are urging reconsideration of the proposal. The Bethesda-Chevy Chase community has been the subject of much planning for both single-family and multiple-family dwelling units, and it is the hope of the residents that such a plan can be followed in the normal growth and development of the community. The construction of private apartments in an area that every county agency has found to be unsuitable for apartment buildings would change the character of the community and upset the long-range plans applicable to it.

For these reasons, and others which we have not had time to develop, we respectfully urge you to withhold your proposed amendment. We should prefer adoption of the original congressionally approved plan to have the hospital construct its own quarters, which could be accomplished by un-

freezing the \$1,125,000 appropriation that was reserved by the Bureau of the Budget last year. But, whether or not that can be done immediately, we certainly feel that the proposal for private construction and operation of housing on public lands has not been adequately explored and should at this stage be sent back to the committee for further study.

We recognize the need of the hospital for these emergency quarters, and feel sure that the Congress will not jeopardize a \$50,000,000 investment because of the lack of adequate housing, which can be provided at a fraction of the hospital cost. But we feel strongly that the proposed method of providing the housing is not the best available method.

Thank you for your consideration of this appeal.

Yours very truly,

WM. J. BARNHARD,
President, Maplewood Citizens Association.

OAKMONT CITIZENS' ASSOCIATION,
Bethesda, Md., June 7, 1951.

Hon. JOHN M. BUTLER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: The Citizens' Committee of Oakmont, as the duly elected governing body of the special taxing area of Oakmont, respectfully solicits your help in securing the elimination of an amendment made by the Appropriations Committee of the Senate to the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, H. R. 3709, now before the Senate.

The amendment in question authorizes the Surgeon General to lease to private interests an unspecified portion of the federally owned land comprising the grounds of the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, for a period of 99 years, for the purpose of construction and operation by such private interests of apartments for rental. Although construction plans for the institutes originally contemplated Government-built and Government-operated housing for a limited number of key personnel who must live on the grounds to meet emergency needs, and although an appropriation for this purpose was made in last year's appropriation act, the committee amendment rescinds this appropriation and substitutes the legislative rider authorizing private construction and operation, described above.

The Citizens' Committee of Oakmont urges that this amendment be stricken from the bill. As you know, Oakmont and other areas abutting on the institutes' grounds are single-family residential areas in which the property owners have thus far successfully fought the intrusion of apartments within their boundaries, with the accompanying depreciation of residential property values. If private interests are permitted to construct and operate apartments for rental on land leased for the purpose by the Government, it will become a practical impossibility longer to prevent the incursion of like developments in the adjacent single-family areas which are privately owned. For these reasons, as you know, the taxpayers in these areas are gravely concerned about the effects of the proposed amendment.

Your help in securing the elimination of the committee amendment and restoring the previously enacted appropriation for Government construction of dwelling units is urgently needed.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM L. DALEY,
Chairman, Oakmont Citizens' Committee.

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.
Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to know whether we are to complete action on the bill tonight.

Mr. McFARLAND. No; it is my purpose to move to have the Senate take a recess until tomorrow as soon as certain incidental matters are acted on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wish to submit an amendment to this bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That can be done tomorrow.

Mr. DIRKSEN. However, I shall not be here tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator wish to make a speech in connection with his amendment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I wish to make a brief speech in connection with it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in further answer to the distinguished Senator from Illinois, let me say that another amendment is pending, and it was thought advisable to have the Senate take a recess at this time until tomorrow. Those in charge of the bill and the distinguished Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] thought that between now and tomorrow they might be able to work out an agreement. I told them that on that basis, I would move that we now take a recess until tomorrow. However, if the distinguished Senator from Illinois wishes to make a few remarks, we shall be glad to accommodate him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to proceed for about 5 minutes, I think I can dispose of the matter I have in mind in that length of time.

Mr. President, I ask the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] not to leave, because I desire to make an observation regarding a matter which I believe will be of interest to him, and probably also to his colleague, the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

The matter is simply this: In February, the Legislature of the State of Indiana enacted a law which requires that the names of the recipients of public assistance under the grant program, which is provided for in the bill now pending before the Senate, shall be made reasonably subject to public inspection. There is a reason for it. A great many abuses have developed as a result of the fact that such names are not subject to public inspection, and it has created something of a difficulty, something of an organization, if I may use the term, among certain social workers, which has become a real abuse within the State of Indiana. That was why the legislature took action.

Strangely enough, the Legislature of the State of Florida took similar action; and the situation has also been under investigation by a joint committee of the Legislature of the State of Tennessee. If I were here tomorrow, I should offer an amendment which I am frank to admit would be legislative in character, and therefore subject to a point of order. The amendment would simply provide that no State shall be denied its appropriate funds under the public assistance program by virtue of the fact that it requires, by legislative enactment, that there shall be reasonable inspection

of the names of those who receive public aid. As a matter of fact, representatives of Indiana are here at the present time. They have a controversy with Oscar Ewing, who for the moment at least feels in duty bound under Federal law to withhold \$20,000,000 from the State of Indiana.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. JENNER. I might state that Indiana has a lien law which is already in existence, and which has been in existence for several years. It was at one time repealed, but it is again on the statute books, where it has been for several years. It provides practically the same thing as that which is provided by the recent act of our State legislature, in that every dollar paid out to an old-age recipient becomes a lien on his property. A lien is a matter of public record and it has been open to the public all these years. But, all of a sudden, a bureaucrat in Washington capriciously says, "By reason of the law which was passed last February, we are going to withhold the \$20,000,000," although they have been giving us our money. It is our money. All these years that lien law has been on the statute books and no one has ever before raised an objection. The situation shows what can be done to the citizens of a State by a bureaucrat in Washington, if he so desires.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to say to my friend that I happened to be in Indianapolis in February when this action was taken by the legislature, which was then in session. My own interest springs from the fact that a great many abuses have developed within the State of Illinois. There has been an awareness in the Illinois State Legislature and it may take some action at a very early date.

The Senate Appropriations Committee was quite aware of this difficulty because, in its report, at least, it makes a passing reference. The committee says:

The growing public dissatisfaction with the granting of relief payments to individuals for whom family care is available was called to the attention of the committee. State legislatures have indicated an awareness of the problem and the committee will expect to observe an awareness on the part of officials of the Bureau of Public Assistance to the end that relief payments are not profligately expended. It is believed that a sterner attitude might result in considerable economy in this program, without denying a single case of bona fide need.

The fact of the matter is that if one examines the rather generous hearings on this subject, he will find that they are very meager and very barren of any observations or any testimony on that point, yet I think it raises one of the foremost issues before the country, by virtue of the fact that since 1943 the amount for public assistance appropriated by Congress has risen from approximately \$400,000,000 to \$1,300,000,000. In the State of Mississippi, in 1948, roughly 400 persons per 1,000 of age 65 were on the relief rolls. Today the number is over 700 per 1,000. I think it sums up to a new formula, under which the Federal Government pays 75 percent of

the first \$20, and 50 percent of the next \$30, up to \$50, and so a State can put up \$1 and get \$3 from the Federal Government. There is a tendency not to scrutinize the real need, but simply to let everyone finally climb onto the assistance rolls.

Recently there was in the Sunday supplement quite a statement on this matter. There were comments from a very wealthy lawyer, for instance, in Georgia, who, in effect, said in reply to an inquiry, "Why should not my folks be upon the relief rolls? After all, I pay taxes. While I can support them, I feel that at least I can get that much out of the public Treasury." I am afraid that attitude is becoming rather common in certain areas of the country, and it needs some scrutiny. There is one way in which it can be done, and that is to allow the legislatures a little latitude in the matter, without having Oscar Ewing finally rule that, because opportunity is given to inspect the names of people who are receiving assistance, therefore, the State is not in compliance with the Social Security Act, and therefore it is his legal responsibility to withhold funds.

I am sure my friend from Florida knows full well what the situation is in his State. It is becoming a problem in other States as well, and I had hoped that the committee would deal with it in more generous fashion than it did in the report and in the hearings.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to say that I am acquainted with the situation, certainly as it exists in Florida. I subscribe to everything which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said. It is my hope, as I know it is the hope of the senior Senator from Florida, that these rolls may somehow be opened to proper inspection. I have personal knowledge of great abuse, which resulted last year by virtue of the fact that the rolls were not made public. Certainly the people of Florida and the people of this Nation are entitled to have the rolls opened up. If there is any way that I can be of assistance in this program, I should like to associate myself with the Senator from Illinois in so doing. I thank him for his remarks.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator from Florida. The only reason for detaining the Senate at this late hour is that I may have no opportunity tomorrow to present this matter. I hope, as my friend from Indiana is here, that he will submit the amendment, and I hope also, notwithstanding the fact that I concede that it is legislative in character and therefore subject to a point of order, that the chairman of the subcommittee will accept it and will take it to conference, and then develop a little more testimony, to see what can be done. The situation is acute. The legislature of the sovereign State of Indiana has spoken. If it stands by its guns, it means that certain people in Indian will be foreclosed. So it is more than a transient question.

I yield the floor.

tion contractors pay nothing toward the construction cost of storage facilities such as provided by Hoover Dam.

The second group of projects include those where the extent of irrigation reimbursability is affected by the special provisions of the Water Conservation and Utilization Act of 1939, and by other special legislation. During the period 1933 to 1940, Congress appropriated large sums for public works throughout the United States. Reclamation projects were among the public works initiated under the authority vested in the President for the expenditure of relief funds. Furthermore, another outgrowth of the depression years was the effort of Congress to provide through reclamation for distressed conditions in the western plains and Mountain States affected by the extreme drought of the mid-1930's. The Conservation and Utilization Project Act of August 11, 1939, authorized the construction of projects on the basis of joint findings of feasibility by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior and approved by the President. The act provided originally for reimbursable appropriations combined with nonreimbursable participation by the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, thereby making projects with a high total cost per acre feasible, provided sufficient relief labor could be made available to hold the reimbursable portion to a reasonable amount. This act ordinarily would have expired with termination of the WPA and CCC at the beginning of World War II. Congress, by the act of July 16, 1943, modified the original law to permit the completion of water conservation and utility projects which could show a general benefit to the war effort.

Projects in this second category of partial irrigation reimbursability, but without reimbursement aid from other project revenues, and the proportion of the irrigation cost payable by the irrigators, are as follows:

	Percent
W. C. Austin.....	19
Balmorhea.....	58
Buffalo Rapids.....	30
Buford-Trenton.....	58
Eden.....	23
Intake.....	50
Kendrick.....	17
Mancos.....	23
Mirage Flats.....	27
Missoula Valley.....	16
Newton.....	49
Rathdrum Prairie.....	64
Scofield.....	26
Tucumcari.....	34

All of the projects in the second group, except W. C. Austin, Kendrick, and Tucumcari, were WCU projects. Other legislation established the extent of irrigation reimbursement for the latter three projects.

The third group of reclamation projects include those where the payment of the costs allocated to irrigation is aided by the application of other net project revenues, such as those from power and municipal water, to the return of irrigation construction costs. This list includes, in addition to several projects authorized by special legislation, those projects for which cost allocations are governed by the provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. This latter act was the first general legislation authorizing cost allocations for reclamation projects; for the first time it brought into reclamation law the concept that benefits from reclamation projects were more than local in scope, and benefits that were national in character should not be a burden on the beneficiaries of reclamation projects.

Projects where the return of the costs allocated to irrigation is aided from other project revenues, and the percentage of pay-

ments estimated to be made by irrigators, include the following:

	Percent
Boise.....	70
Central Valley.....	68
Colorado-Big Thompson.....	28
Columbia Basin.....	26
Minidoka.....	99
Missouri River Basin.....	35
Rio Grande.....	74
Riverton.....	99
Shoshone.....	95
Weber Basin.....	74
Yakima.....	85

Information on the recently authorized Middle Rio Grande, Palsadcs, and Solano projects is in process of analysis and can be supplied at a later date when the cost allocations have been formalized. Information on the Yakima project does not include the Kennewick and Roza divisions, and not all of the Folsom Reservoir cost and payments are included in the Central Valley project data. You will understand, of course, that the data for the Missouri River basin apply to the basin as a whole, whereas the proportion of reimbursability by individual units of the project is expected to vary considerably around this average.

Thank you very much for this opportunity of providing you with this information.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to suspend the rule.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I notice that an error has crept into the wording of the bill. It was not the intention of the Committee on Appropriations, or the subcommittee, nor of the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from New Mexico or any Senator, that Freedmen's Hospital should be included in the cut.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wanted to ask the Senator from New Mexico to ask unanimous consent—or the Senator from Michigan will make the request—that that limitation be stricken from the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order to put the matter before the Senate, I will say that through inadvertence a limitation was included in the bill, as shown on page 13, line 8, as follows: "of which not more than \$2,053,786 shall be available for personal services." I ask unanimous consent that that limitation be stricken, inasmuch as it was included through an error, and in direct contravention of the committee action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when the Senate recessed on yesterday we were discussing the amendment submitted by

the Senator from New Mexico with reference to the construction of housing units at the medical center. This morning the Senator from New Mexico received a letter from Assistant Surgeon General W. H. Sebrell, Jr., the Director of the National Institutes of Health, with reference to that particular amendment. The subject was thoroughly discussed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and by the Senator from New Mexico. I should like to have Senators who are interested in this amendment listen to this letter:

JUNE 13, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: At the request of your subcommittee on appropriations of the Senate, we are submitting the following information concerning certain aspects of housing for key emergency personnel required for operation of the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health.

1. Costs—

I believe the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] inquired as to costs.

Estimates were made and submitted May 16, 1951, on the costs of Government operation of the 60 units, which had been provided in fiscal 1951 appropriations. These were \$58,000 per annum and included utilities, and direct expense for operation, maintenance, and repair of structures and equipment. When this figure for 60 units is projected to include 250 units, it becomes \$241,000—

Which the Government would have to spend on the upkeep of the structures if the Government were to build them.

Also, for the 250 units, there are additional requirements of \$33,500 for the maintenance and repair of roads and walks, street lighting, and the grounds upkeep, making a total per annum cost of \$274,500.

2. Revenue: As income to offset these costs, estimates were made and submitted also on May 16, 1951. These indicated that from 60 units the annual revenue to the Government would be \$56,600. When this figure for 60 units is projected to include 250 units, it becomes \$236,000.

To the State of Maryland. So in arriving at a conclusion the Senate must decide whether someone should pay taxes to the State of Maryland to the extent of \$250,000, or whether the Government should pay for the upkeep.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will yield as soon as I have finished reading the letter. Continuing:

However, only 95 percent occupancy can be expected on 250 units. Therefore, the net revenue per annum becomes \$226,400.

3. The difference between the estimated costs of \$274,500 and revenue of \$226,400 is \$48,100. These figures, according to standard Government practice, do not include annual interest on the capital investment or estimates for depreciation.

4. It is estimated that 250 units would represent a capital investment, if built by private enterprise, of approximately \$2,500,000. The county manager of Montgomery County—

The legal, political, and fiscal entity of Montgomery County—

informs us that the tax rate estimated to be applicable here is \$2.40 per \$100 and that evaluations are about 65 percent of construction costs. When 65 percent of \$2,500,000 is taken, it amounts to \$1,625,000, to which is

applied the tax rate. On this tax base Montgomery County would obtain an annual tax revenue of \$39,000. The calculation does not include State tax revenues which would come from net income.

5. The proposed language incorporates those provisions of the Wherry Act (Public Law 211, 81st Cong.) which are applicable to the housing requirements of the Clinical Center.

In other words, within the provisions of the Wherry Act provision could be made applicable to the clinic at Bethesda. Senators should bear in mind that the Senator from New Mexico is not directly interested one way or the other in the Bethesda Center, except from the standpoint of the public welfare and good government. He is not politically or personally interested in the problem.

The term of 99 years for the lease was taken from section 801 (a), which defines the "mortgage" available for insurance under the Wherry Act to mean "a first mortgage on real estate, in fee simple, or on a leasehold (1) under a lease for not less than 99 years which is renewable; or (2) under a lease for a period of not less than 50 years to run from the date the mortgage was executed * * *." Our legal counsel recommended as best for NIH purposes the phrase "not more than 99 years" without the renewable clause of the Wherry Act. In fact, the project—

He is now speaking of the Medical Center—

can be soundly operated and amortized on a 50-year basis if that is preferred.

The provision that the Surgeon General establish terms and conditions for the lease is adapted from section 805 of the Wherry Act, which states: "Whenever the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force determines that it is desirable to lease real property * * * to effectuate the purposes of this title, the Secretary concerned is authorized to lease such property * * * upon such terms and conditions as in his opinion will best serve the national interest"—

So everything would be kept within proper legal authority.

The extension of the Surgeon General's "terms and conditions" to regulate the private operation of the quarters is similar to section 803, subsection (b) (2), which states that "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for such personnel and their immediate families shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Commissioner."

I call this portion of the letter particularly to the attention of my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who sponsored the so-called Wherry Act.

The principal feature of the Wherry Act which is not contained in the proposed language is the Government insurance provision to protect the mortgage. After consultation with the Federal Housing Administration and the Bureau of the Budget, we felt confident that the NIH quarters, as a part of a permanent medical research center—

Long ago authorized by the Congress—may well have less investment risk for a private developer than housing projects at isolated military installations. The language would therefore permit the successful bidder to secure conventional private financing or to apply for mortgage insurance under Federal Housing procedure.

We have been hearing about that for years. We have been hearing about getting back to normalcy and letting Amer-

ican business proceed in the way it has proceeded for many years. That is what we are trying to do by this amendment.

The language would therefore permit the successful bidder—

I do not know who he might be, but he would be in private enterprise. He would be investing his own money. He would be taking a chance, including the chance of being able to rent the property—

to secure conventional private financing or to apply for mortgage insurance under Federal Housing procedure.

What is wrong with that? The successful bidder could go to a bank in Maryland or in Washington and he could say, "I have a legitimate business proposal to build houses at the Medical Center in Bethesda. Do you think it is a good business deal?" In other words, Mr. President, he would take a chance, and the banker would take a chance. Under the law he could also apply for conventional mortgage insurance under the Federal Housing procedure. We passed the law. What is wrong with a builder in Bethesda, in order to carry out the provisions of a law which Congress passed, when building houses which are needed at the Medical Center in Bethesda, to applying for mortgage insurance?

I continue to read from the letter:

In the latter case the standard FHA regulations would be incorporated in the terms and conditions determined by the Surgeon General.

It would not be a one-way affair. It would be in keeping with what I think has been the desire, especially on the other side of the aisle, that we let business take its course.

6. To make the intent of the legislation quite clear, especially to the community, it may be desirable—

We are now talking about the fine citizens of Montgomery County, who live within the area in which the National Institutes of Health are located—

it may be desirable to specify clearly a limitation of "not to exceed 250 units, the occupancy of which shall be limited entirely to the employees of the National Institutes of Health."

Mr. President, my home is 2,000 miles from Montgomery County, Md. However, I know Montgomery County. I know families in Montgomery County. I know teachers in Rockville. I know nurses in Bethesda. Some of the residents there are former citizens of my State, who now live within the area. But they own their own homes, and pay taxes in Montgomery County. The interest of the Senator from New Mexico in this instance is not personal or political. I am trying to perform my duty as chairman of a subcommittee which is investigating the requirements of Federal functions. I say to Senators, "Do not tell me that you want the Government to proceed in a normal way, if you object to a committee recommendation that we let private enterprise in the State of Maryland construct houses at no cost to the American taxpayers anywhere in the country, including Montgomery County, and by which the State of Maryland would collect taxes."

The houses would have to be built anyway.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will yield in a moment. Millions of dollars of taxpayers' money has been spent to construct the institution. No one would dare say it should not be there. The National Institutes of Health are a creature of the Congress of the United States. I congratulate the State of Maryland and the people of Montgomery County that the Congress of the United States was able to build the institution in Montgomery County.

The Institute is active. It is investigating the heart conditions of millions of people. It is investigating the mental health of millions of people. It is investigating the causes of cancer throughout the country, and endeavoring to find a cure for that dread disease. It is dealing with human beings and with humanity. Congress, in its wisdom, placed the institution in Montgomery County and has appropriated millions of dollars for it. It is continuing to operate. The people who are connected with the institution are entitled to have a place to sleep. They are entitled to be out of the weather. The only question is whether we want to provide for them through a Government appropriation, by taking the money out of the taxpayers' pockets, or letting American businessmen take a chance. The issue is simple. There is no question in my mind about the necessity of constructing the housing.

I will say to my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that I think he sponsored a very fine law. I believe it is in keeping with what we are all trying to fight for, namely, the American way of life. If Jim Jones, of Bethesda or Baltimore, wants to construct 250 units at Bethesda and take the chance that he will get his money back, what is wrong with letting him do it? Is that not preferable to taking money from the Federal Treasury, a process to which so many have been objecting?

I now yield to my good friend from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The junior Senator from Maryland certainly does not object to providing adequate housing at the National Health Institutes at Bethesda. I realize that housing will have to be built. However, directly across the road from the Bethesda Medical Center there are apartment units similar to the ones which are proposed to be built under the Senator's amendment. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether the State of Maryland receives one penny of taxes from any of the apartment units which are located across the street from the Medical Center?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what we are trying to avoid. That is why we are recommending this kind of construction. Out of all the apartment units at the Naval Clinic the State of Maryland does not receive 1 cent in taxes. We are trying to help the State of Maryland get some return from the construction of the buildings.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not correct to say that under existing law the Government of the United States could tax the property at any time it desired to do so, even though it had been built under private auspices?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is not going to argue with me along that line, because I know what it means to have land in the ownership of the Federal Government. Sixty-three percent of all the land of my State is not on the tax rolls of my State. Thirty-seven percent of the land of the State pays for the cost of the State Government. I understand what the Senator from Maryland has in mind. I would not like to see the Federal Government go to Virginia and take eight counties completely off the tax rolls. Nor would I like to see the Federal Government do it in New Mexico or in Maryland. But in order to be consistent, what we are trying to do is to help avoid a similar situation in Montgomery County. We are trying to permit the State of Maryland to collect some taxes from this development.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is there any compelling reason why the conference committee could not strike out the tax provision? Taxes are not paid in similar situations, so why should we in Maryland be treated differently in that respect?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Maryland wishes to have arrangements made so that Maryland will be unable to collect taxes in connection with this development?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; I do not. I want Maryland to be able to collect taxes, and that is the only inducement to the county authorities to favor this provision. I know the amendment contains a provision in regard to taxes, but there is no reason why the conference committee could not strike it out, and the conference committee probably would.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Maryland to have the same faith in me that I have in him.

On page 6568 of the RECORD we find the following:

such quarters and facilities to be constructed and operated without regard to local zoning limitations, but to be subject—

That is rather clear language—

for the term of the lease to State and local taxation on the same basis as other property in the community.

If the Senator from Maryland can suggest clearer language than that to carry out that purpose, we shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am not complaining about the language, but I point out that there are similar housing units within 100 yards of this very location, and from them the government of Maryland collects no taxes. So it is not very likely that the development now under discussion would continue to pay

taxes for any length of time, because it is an integral part of the hospital—just as much a part of the hospital as is the operating room of the hospital.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; so far as the legal entities are concerned, they are two separate developments. The development the Senator from Maryland is now discussing is a naval institution, pure and simple. The National Institutes of Health are separate units, created by the Congress for particular purposes. They have nothing to do with taking care of those in the Navy who are sick.

I agree with the Senator from Maryland with regard to the taxation feature. I object just as strenuously as he does to tax exemption, because millions of acres in my State are not on the tax rolls, and I do not like to have the Federal Government take property off the tax rolls in Virginia or in New Mexico or in Prince Georges County or Montgomery County, Md., or any other county, and not make some kind of recompense for it. That is what we are trying to arrange for here; we are trying to place Maryland in the position the Senator from Maryland has in mind.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me, to permit me to make a statement?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. First, I desire to express to the senior Senator from New Mexico our appreciation of his forthrightness and his very commendable attitude. I know full well that the Senator from New Mexico is almost as much a part of the State of Maryland as are the citizens of Maryland who vote there and claim Maryland as their residence.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I love the free State.

Mr. O'CONOR. I say that because over a period of many years the Senator from New Mexico has, either directly or indirectly, been associated with Maryland in one way or another, and has been most welcome there. He is highly regarded by the citizens of the State; and I know full well that in connection with this matter he has the interests of the State of Maryland just as much at heart as do we who have been elected from that State.

There are several aspects of this matter to which I should like to address myself, if I may have the permission of the Senator from New Mexico to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in making this brief statement, I wish to say first that I associate myself with the position taken yesterday in the Senate by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. I am familiar with what he has stated, and I am in full accord with the views he expresses, because I feel that an overriding consideration in connection with this entire matter is the effect on the interests of the property owners and citizens of that very enterprising community. As the Senator from New Mexico well knows, there is

hardly to be found a community whose citizens have invested more of their own possessions and have built homes with greater expectations of personal enjoyment of them than have the citizens of this area of Montgomery County. The splendid residences which they have built give evidence of their interest and faith in that community.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I should like to ask whether he feels that the expenditure of the millions of dollars at the Bethesda Naval Hospital and the millions of dollars at the National Institutes of Health has interfered with the development the Senator from Maryland has just mentioned.

Mr. O'CONOR. I am very glad the Senator from New Mexico has asked that question, because I happened to be present when the cornerstone of the Naval Hospital was laid by a great American, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Since that time I have followed the progress of that institution and I have familiarized myself with it, so that certainly I know what has transpired there. I am confidently of the belief that that institution has been of great benefit to America. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct in what he has so eloquently stated in regard to the humanitarian efforts and the successful endeavors which have been made there in Maryland in the interest of humankind.

Although possibly we in Maryland have suffered by reason of a slight diminution of tax revenues, nevertheless that has been overbalanced, I am sure, by the great benefits which have come to other States and, I may say, to the entire world as a result of the research and other work which has been done there.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'CONOR. I am very glad to have the Senator from New Mexico do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The personnel at the naval hospital and the personnel at the National Institutes of Health are considerable in number, as I am sure the Senator from Maryland will agree.

Mr. O'CONOR. Yes, I agree.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Those persons make daily purchases within the State of Maryland, and the State of Maryland has a sales tax. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'CONOR. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So by reason of the expenditure of these millions of dollars of Federal Government funds, although the State of Maryland may not be able to collect quite as much money in the way of property taxes, it does obtain the benefit of the additional payments which are made in connection with its sales tax. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'CONOR. Although I agree with the Senator, yet probably this is not the time to debate those relative benefits and advantages or disadvantages. However, the Senator is correct in saying that immediate benefits do flow from that source.

I return to the point that the State of Maryland and, in particularly, the immediate community affected, have given

much to these very worthy institutions and also have suffered some losses by way of a decrease in tax revenues. However, I prefer not to base my conclusion upon that consideration as much as upon the immediate effect on the residents who are members of that great and splendid community—and particularly upon the question of whether we in Congress may be doing something which will adversely affect the holdings and homes and residences of the several thousands of families who live in that immediate vicinity.

Mr. President, several questions were raised in yesterday's debate which we think have since been clarified. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico stated that the crux of this issue is whether the nurses' and doctors' quarters, which are to be a part of the Government hospital, shall be built with private money or with Government money, and he, together with one of the other Members of the Senate, understandably indicates a preference for the use of private money.

I may say that I am heartily in accord with the maximum use of private enterprise and the minimum use of public construction; but it seems to me that that principle does not entirely solve the problems which we here face. We believe that Government money will pay for these hospital quarters, no matter what or who constructs and operates them, and that it is for us to consider whether it might be more expensive for the Federal taxpayers if the quarters were privately constructed and operated; because, if this were not so, then the Government might be making a serious mistake by constructing its own buildings elsewhere, as in the case of post offices and Army barracks.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder whether the Senator has considered the question as to which of these programs would throw the heavier burden upon the taxpayers.

Mr. O'CONOR. I have given consideration to that, and we believe that ultimately there will be a greater burden thrown upon the local taxpayers if it is financed in the way which has here been suggested. We believe that the nurses' home and the quarters for resident surgeons and house doctors are as much parts of a hospital as are the wards, kitchens, and operating rooms. At the Bethesda Naval Hospital, as has been stated by the junior Senator from Maryland, directly across the road from the National Institutes of Health, quarters are provided for both the professional and the nonprofessional staffs. Every Government hospital of which I have heard provides necessary quarters for its key personnel and offices appropriate to the construction of the hospital. The authorization for this research hospital now under construction included not only the hospital building, but also the necessary service buildings and the essential quarters for the hospital personnel. If this building, which is part of a public construction project on public

land, to house public employees, is constructed with private capital and operated privately, the Government will be paying the rent on the building through the rental allowance it must pay to its commissioned personnel.

It was stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday that there would be annual operating costs of about \$58,000 if the Government were to build and to operate these quarters, and the statement was repeated this morning. But it was not pointed out that there would be an annual rental of approximately from \$200,000 to \$300,000 paid out of appropriated funds if private persons were to operate the 250-unit project.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not quite get the Senator's point. I wonder whether the Senator would elaborate on it, because I am very much interested in it. In order that the Senator may understand the point of my question, I may say it is my understanding that in all of the Wherry housing, whether it is connected with military installations or colleges, or whether it is connected with atomic-energy projects, the conditions are prescribed by the Government, and the lessee must account for his own rents.

Yesterday afternoon the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], if I understood his statement, said it would cost more to build this project under private enterprise than for the Government to build it, because of the rental consideration, and that the cost to the taxpayer would be greater. What I was apprehensive about last night was whether the project as provided for by the amendment would meet the conditions of the Federal Housing Authority for insurance and in other ways. If those conditions cannot be met, the structure cannot be built by private enterprise. If they can be met, certainly the private enterpriser who builds the project will be able to get the money from the revenues derived with which to pay the necessary annual amortization on the project until it is completely amortized, at which time it will then revert to the one who gives the lease.

Mr. O'CONOR. I may answer—

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will pardon me, what I desire the Senator from Maryland to explain to me is this: If that be true, if those provisions are met, then will the Senator please say why he thinks that, if the Government builds this project by direct appropriations, it will cost the taxpayers less money than if it were built otherwise? Does the Senator understand what I mean?

Mr. O'CONOR. I understand, and I am in accord with the junior Senator from Maryland, whom I see standing, wanting to comment; and I shall be very glad to have him do so, if he desires.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The senior Senator from Maryland has the floor, and I would rather have him do it.

Mr. O'CONOR. In answer to the Senator from Nebraska, I may say I

agree with the position taken by the junior Senator from Maryland, because I think the allowances which are made to the personnel must necessarily be such that the builder will be operating at a profit. While we, of course, applaud every effort made to have private enterprise take over, yet in this particular instance, where there are conditions totally different from those covered by construction projects under the Wherry Act—

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, please. I did not get the Senator's last statement.

Mr. O'CONOR. I was about to say that I think there are conditions obtaining in this case which are vastly different from those which apply to construction under the Wherry Act. I recall being with the junior Senator from Nebraska at the ground-breaking at the Naval Academy.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONOR. There, where there was no other housing available and where there were possibilities of deactivation, which of course would make it unattractive possibly for private capital to undertake construction, it was very necessary that the housing should be provided and that the Government should erect it. As the Senator from New Mexico has stated, I think the Senator from Nebraska did a very splendid thing in sponsoring the so-called Wherry Act, but we think the conditions in this instance are so different as to make that act inapplicable.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'CONOR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the difference between the conditions which are imposed by the provisions of the Wherry Act on a project on a military installation, or one near military installations, and this project in Maryland?

Mr. O'CONOR. Take the one where the Senator from Nebraska personally participated in the ground-breaking: Had it not been for the procedure followed in that construction work, I dare say the facilities would not have been made available, because there were conditions applicable at that location which might very well have made it unattractive to private enterprise.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. It is the question of building an installation in an isolated place, where it would not otherwise be built.

Mr. O'CONOR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to resolve this question in my own mind. If the explanation which has been given is correct—and I have no reason to doubt it at all—all the conditions of the Wherry Act are complied with in the case of this installation in Maryland, even regarding insurance. It is even thought to be much better so far as the insurance feature goes than an installation of a military character in an isolated place, and that it is even more attractive commercially. Is it not a fact that all these units will be rented? If anyone who works at the Institutes have an allowance because of his military status, he

would have the same privilege anywhere he went.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That would be true, whether he went to Annapolis or wherever he went.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. If this is to be a private building it must obtain revenue from monthly rentals payable in cash, in order to fulfill the conditions imposed by the Wherry Act, and the situation in that respect would be the same in Maryland as it is supposed to be throughout the country.

I ask the Senator from Maryland to point out wherein there is any difference. If there is no difference, then I am forced to say that certainly the housing should be built in the private-enterprise way, and, for the life of me, I cannot see that it would cost more to do it that way than it would to have it built at Government expense.

Mr. O'CONOR. If the Senator will bear with me for a few more moments, we have made a computation of rentals, cost, and allowances, and we find that there will be made available for rentals approximately \$250,000, which amount, of course, the Government will continue to pay and which we think will more than offset the allowances.

Mr. WHERRY. The allowances are an entirely different matter. They would not make any difference at all. If I built an installation in Washington and an Army officer who could not live on the post had to rent privately, he would pay me the cash, because it would be allowed to him by the Government. There is not involved the question of a subsidy to be paid directly by the Government to the private-enterprise builder. That is the point I am making. There might be difficulties with reference to zoning. There might be a building on Government property constructed by outside builders in the locality. There might be some zoning condition, some opening up of territory to private builders, but if I correctly understand the explanation, I do not see any difference, in the application of the law in Maryland and any other State, with reference to any military or near-military installation, under the provisions of the Wherry Act, which provides that the construction must be amortized by private money until it is paid for, and that then it shall revert to the Government.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator. I have yielded to the senior Senator from Maryland for the purpose of making an explanation, but I do not desire to lose my place on the floor.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Maryland be allowed to make a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the junior Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to answer, if I can, the argument of the Senator from Nebraska. I think there is this difference: If the housing

accommodations were not built under Federal auspices and those needing quarters had to get their housing in a private building, it would cost the Government more money, through the granting of allowances, than it would to build the housing.

Mr. WHERRY. If the officers receive allowances it does not make any difference whether they live in Maryland or in Nebraska. They have to account for the rental.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is my understanding that if they are in Government housing they do not get allowances.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it will be found that in the case of officers, they are given rental as a part of their compensation, wherever they are located, and in the event they do not have quarters on the post, they have to pay rental, whether the housing is built privately or by the Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we are talking directly about the National Institutes of Health. There is only one class of persons who would be eligible for allowances. They are commissioned officers in the Public Health Service. Besides that, there are nurses, the custodial force, the man who shovels the coal or turns on the oil for the furnace, and there are other workers who do not receive any allowance and who would be subject to paying rent to the private enterprise.

It is extremely simple, in the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico. I hope Senators will not tell me how much they love private enterprise. There is one thing that should be done; housing must be provided for those connected with the institutes of health. Do we want the Government to build it, or do we want some businessman from the State of Maryland to build it? That is all there is to the question.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have the figures on personnel connected with all the national health institutes, whether they be heart, cancer, mental diseases, tuberculosis, poliomyelitis, sanitation, or milk pasteurization.

Mr. O'CONOR. Are these the figures requested by the junior Senator from Maryland yesterday?

Mr. HILL. Yes. There are 186 commissioned officers. The civilian personnel is 1,794.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And they do not receive allowances.

Mr. HILL. The latter class, the civilian personnel, have no allowances whatever. Much the larger number of these units will be occupied by civilian employees who receive no allowances. With all appreciation of the distinguished Senators from Maryland, and with all respect for them, the argument they make is an argument against the Wherry Act, which was passed a good many months ago, and which certainly, so far as the evidence before the Appropriations Committee shows, has worked very well. The distinguished author of that act, who deserves much credit for his authorship of it, knows that time and

again we have asked the question, "How is the Wherry Act working out? Is it doing what its distinguished author contemplated?" The witnesses have shown us how well it has worked out. The argument made by the distinguished Senators from Maryland applies merely to that act.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I feel that the project is so greatly needed that whether it be constructed under the Wherry law or under a Government appropriation, it should, nevertheless, be constructed. I think both Senators from Maryland have agreed that the construction of the housing units is needed. If they do not want it done under the Wherry law, I will accept an amendment making a direct appropriation for the construction. But let the units be constructed.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator permit an amendment to make a direct Government appropriation?

Mr. O'CONOR. I want to state clearly what is in my mind. I am sure that my able colleague understands that what the Senators from Maryland are trying to do is to protect the people of our State, protect them in their possessions, their residences and holdings, and to avoid any adverse effect on a taxable basis. I am sure the Senator from New Mexico is equally earnest in his desire to preserve those values, and I ask him to give attention to the language on line 10 of the proposed amendment, which states that the quarters and facilities are to be constructed and operated without regard to local zoning limitations. Of course, that has been a matter of considerable concern to our people, because it would indicate that this particular operation and construction of quarters and facilities would be done in defiance of, or certainly leaving out of consideration, all that has been built up in the way of zoning regulations. I am confident that the Senator from New Mexico has no intention to overthrow those safeguards which, of course, are so necessary for the preservation of values. I am wondering whether the Senator is of the opinion that provision could be eliminated and whether he could give assurance, so far as assurance can be given, that the language can be changed—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the amendment as now submitted was not a recommendation of the committee. After consultation with the class of citizens of Montgomery County, Md., to whom the senior Senator from Maryland has referred, they submitted the amendment which is now being considered. They were property owners in the immediate vicinity, persons for whom I know the Senators from Maryland have the highest regard. But I want the construction to proceed. I think it is needed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Certainly if the United States Government constructs this housing, as it will do, because it must do it unless we provide for its construction by private enterprise, along the lines of the

amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Federal Government is not going to give any consideration to the question of zoning.

Mr. O'CONOR. I understand that.

Mr. HILL. There is a much better chance that a private builder, a local citizen of the great State of Maryland, will give much more consideration to zoning than will the United States Government. If the Government undertakes the project I am sure it will build the housing as convenience dictates, and without regard to zoning.

Mr. O'CONOR. The Senator from Alabama is entirely correct. But if the construction is to be by private builders, and if the provision to which I have referred is written into the law in express language, it will represent an entire departure from zoning regulations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to carry out the ideas expressed by the two Senators from Maryland with respect to protecting the property owners' rights. They have made their investments, and I want to see their homes protected. Why do not the two Senators from Maryland permit us to take the amendment to conference? The conferees will discuss the subject, and I can assure my two good friends from Maryland that, so far as the conferees on the part of the Senate are concerned, we will do nothing that will in any way jeopardize the property rights of any good citizen of Montgomery County or the State of Maryland.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe what the Senators have in mind will be accomplished if the Senator from New Mexico will do what I understood him, last night, to say he would do, ask unanimous consent to strike out the syllable "out" in the third word in line 10.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, what the Senator says is exactly our position.

Mr. WHERRY. So, after the word "operated", the word "with" would follow, striking out the syllable "out", so the language in that line would be "and operated with regard to local zoning limitations." I believe such a change would solve the whole problem.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In all sincerity, I will say to the two Senators from Maryland that if they will permit us to take the amendment to conference, with that proposed change, we will work the provision out intelligently and within reason.

Mr. WHERRY. So the word would be "with," instead of "without."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, the word would be "with."

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from New Mexico agree to strike out the syllable "out"?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. O'CONOR. The provision will be acceptable if that change is made, so the word will be "with" instead of "without."

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is agreeable. I shall be glad to take that language to conference so we can discuss the subject intelligently and in a reasonable way. I

believe in acting in a reasonable manner. I do not believe in bullheadedness, or in endeavoring to use driving power, or anything like that. I like to discuss what is the best manner of procedure with my fellow Senators and conferees.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. What will this project cost?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that 250 units, built by private enterprise, will cost approximately \$2,500,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Two million five hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Could not this matter be postponed until our foreign troubles are settled? We are in a war.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. We have settled the matter now.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are spending sixty to seventy billions of dollars this year. Could we not postpone this item until a little later?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me correct the Senator from Tennessee, to whom I am very much devoted. We are trying to get private enterprise to invest money, without appropriating any of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. McKELLAR. There will be no appropriation under this item?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not a penny.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. We have already appropriated \$1,125,000 for this project, which is now available. If we can have the amendment agreed to, and permit private enterprise to construct the project, then that \$1,125,000 will not be taken out of the Federal Treasury; not a penny of it will be taken out of the Federal Treasury for this project.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are trying to have private enterprise construct the building. I will take the matter to conference, if the Senators from Maryland agree.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I should like to withdraw the point of order I raised against the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I further modify my amendment, on page 1, line 10, by striking out the syllable "out" in the third word, thus leaving the language in that line reading: "and operated with regard to local zoning limitations, but."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico has modified his amendment.

Mr. O'CONOR. Will the Senator from New Mexico allow me to thank him very much for his consideration in this whole matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico withdraw his motion to suspend the rule?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I submit the amendment, as modified. The junior

Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] has withdrawn his point of order. I ask for action on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair wishes to inform the Senator that the point of order was not ruled on.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, but the Senator from Maryland withdrew his point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question reverts to consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; as modified by the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As modified, the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, after "\$250,000" in line 19, it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided, That the Surgeon General is authorized, on such terms and conditions as he determines are appropriate for the efficient operation of the combined hospital and research building, to lease for a total of not more than 99 years a portion of the present site of the National Institutes of Health for the construction, operation, and maintenance thereon by the lessee of rental quarters, but not to exceed 250 units limited exclusively to occupancy by employees of the National Institutes of Health and necessary related facilities, such quarters and facilities to be constructed and operated with regard to local zoning limitations, but to be subject for the term of the lease to State and local taxation on the same basis as other property in the community: *Provided further*, That not more than \$50,000 of the amounts heretofore appropriated to the construction of additional auxiliary structures under this head shall be available for expenditure by the Public Health Service for the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction on the property leased pursuant to the preceding provision, such expenditure to be repaid by the lessee and credited to such appropriation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for the considerate treatment he has accorded me during the debate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the Record ought to show that what we have done does not represent an idle gesture, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate will stand by the amendment in conference. I have faith in their doing so, so that if the project is to be built in accordance with the terms of the amendment, it will be built in line with the local zoning regulations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I firmly believe in the action taken by the Senate.

I submit another amendment, Mr. President, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, after "title" in line 13, it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided further, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, line 6, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "\$33,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a proposal to diminish by \$3,000,000—

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I be permitted to finish the sentence, and then I will yield. I will yield at the end of a sentence, but not at the end of a clause.

Mr. WHERRY. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I believe that Senators should be present to hear the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not anxious about that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would not mind having a quorum call, because the Senator from Illinois is about to discuss the Children's Bureau. I should like to have more Senators listen to the argument of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may yield for the purpose of a quorum call?

Mr. WHERRY. I so request, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois shall not lose the floor, and that we may proceed with a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McMahon
Anderson	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Moody
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Morse
Bricker	Hill	Mundt
Bridges	Hoey	Neely
Butler, Md.	Holland	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	O'Connor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Connally	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Knowland	Sparkman
Dworshak	Langer	Stennis
Eastland	Lehman	Taft
Eaton	Long	Thye
Ellender	Magnuson	Tobey
Ferguson	Malone	Underwood
Flanders	Maybank	Watkins
Frear	McCarran	Welker
Fulbright	McCarthy	Wherry
George	McClellan	Wiley
Gillette	McFarland	Williams
Green	McKellar	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair.) A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered would reduce by \$3,000,000 the amount granted to the States for maternal and child welfare.

Yesterday, when I proposed to reduce the amounts for the teaching of retail selling, I was accused of being against motherhood, the selling of ribbons, and gifts. I suppose today, in proposing to reduce the amount of the grants to the States for maternal and child welfare, I will be accused not only of being against mothers, but of being against children, the American home, and pure milk.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, it is necessary to observe a very simple fact. In 1951 there was appropriated for this purpose \$30,250,000. The 1952 estimates submitted by the Budget Bureau were \$33,000,000. The House cut the amount to \$30,000,000, or roughly the same as was appropriated last year. There is also a carry-over from last year of ap-

proximately \$3,000,000. So if we add the carry-over of \$3,000,000 to the appropriation of \$30,000,000 for this year, we reach a total of \$33,000,000, or the amount which the Bureau of the Budget estimated for 1952.

As I understand it, Mr. President, the carry-over of \$3,000,000 arises from the fact that a number of the States have not fully utilized the grants the Federal Government has made to them. Therefore, I propose that we utilize the unexpended balance, in order to help reach the total of \$33,000,000, which was recommended. Twenty States of the 48 have had carry-overs; they have not spent all the grants the Federal Government has made to them. Twenty-eight States have spent all the grants which have been made to them. The funds are not transferable, so they cannot be transferred from the 20 States which have carry-overs to the 28 States which do not have carry-overs. Thus, in the 28 States there would actually be a reduction in the amounts requested by the Bureau of the Budget, but they would still get about the same amounts as they got last year.

Mr. President, I know this is a somewhat unpopular proposal to make, for it is unquestionably a fine program. I campaigned for it myself in the 1920's. But I should like to point out that this bill contains funds for other fine programs, which we not only failed to increase over the amounts appropriated last year but actually cut below last year's level. For instance, I think we all agree that the tuberculosis program is a fine one. Yet we cut that appropriation a half million dollars below that of last year. We cut the communicable diseases program nearly a third of a million dollars. We cut the National Heart Institute by nearly a half million dollars and we also cut the National Cancer Institute below what we appropriated last year.

As I say, Mr. President, the maternal and child health program is a good one. But so is research in tuberculosis, communicable diseases, cancer, and heart ailments. All I am saying is that we will not wreck the program, and we can treat it the same as the others by reducing the Senate committee figure of \$33,000,000 down to \$30,000,000, which is about the same level as last year. And, in so doing, we can save \$3,000,000.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the appropriation be reduced from \$33,000,000 to \$30,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Aside from the health-research work done in research laboratories and the work done in hospitals, I certainly do not know of anything more important than maternal care and child care; in fact, I am not sure that I do not regard all of them as of equal importance, although it will be recalled that within the last few days I fought with all the force at my command against the proposal to make a

reduction in the appropriation for research laboratories and hospitals.

Certainly I believe that maternal care and child care are just as important as our defense efforts. Certainly we cannot afford to jeopardize the welfare of the mothers or to jeopardize the welfare of the children of this country or decrease the care and help we give to them.

I realize perfectly well that we are now in the midst of a great emergency. I know that all of us have to make sacrifices in meeting the requirements of the emergency; but the emergency will not last forever. On the other hand, the children whom we may neglect today will grow up; and if we do not care for them now, we may have a liability, rather than an asset, later on.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois, for whom I have very great regard, but who I know is as deeply moved by the health needs and moral needs of our country as is any other Member of this body, has objected to the increase of \$3,000,000 in the proposed appropriation, and he has referred to the fact that this year there is a carry-over of \$3,000,000 from the appropriation made last year. As I understand, that carry-over does not benefit all the States of the Union. I believe I am correct in saying that the Senator from Illinois said that 28 of the States have used up their full quotas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Therefore, even though there may be a carry-over on paper, those 28 States—and I do not know which States they are; I do not know whether my own State is included among them—will have cuts made in their funds, if the proposed reduction in the appropriation is made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks of the 28 States, and he is correct in saying that those 28 States will have cuts made in their funds for maternal care and child-health services. There are also 43 States which will have cuts made in their funds for services to crippled children. So the amendment affects both the 28 States which are involved so far as maternal care and child care are concerned, and the 43 States which are involved insofar as their funds for services to crippled children are concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the able Senator from Alabama for his very valuable remarks; by his statement he has strengthened the case which I am trying to present to my colleagues in the Senate, and he has shown the unwisdom of making the proposed reduction in the appropriation.

It is true that we are asked to appropriate \$3,000,000 more than was appropriated last year, but every Member of this body knows that during the past year the cost of living and the costs of administration and the costs of operation have increased to such a great extent that an increase of more than \$3,000,000 really is required in connection with this appropriation. Therefore, when it is proposed that we appropriate \$33,000,000 instead of the \$30,000,000 which was appropriated last year, the

result of adopting that proposal will not be to increase in the slightest degree the scope of the work. All we are asking is that the work continue on an undiminished scale. I wish we could greatly increase the scale of the work, but of course we know the exigencies of the present situation. Therefore, we do not request an increase in the scope or scale of the work; but certainly we ask that this highly important work, which concerns every man, woman, and child in the United States, be not curtailed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I very much hope that my colleagues in the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have such great respect for the Senator from Illinois that I am really surprised that he should propose the amendment he has submitted. I rise in opposition to it. I know the Senator from Illinois is sincere in his efforts to reduce the expenses of the Government. However, it is quite possible for us to vote for reductions in appropriations which actually will not result in making any savings.

In this instance, the proposed reduction would hit the lifeline of the United States. This amendment, if adopted, would strike a very serious and heavy blow at the funds to be appropriated and made available for the care of crippled children and for maternal care. So I am surprised that my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, should even offer the amendment.

In connection with this amendment, as proposed, I wish to read from the committee hearings on page 527, where there is found the testimony of Miss Katharine F. Lenroot in regard to this item. In speaking of the proposed cut in the funds for child welfare, Miss Lenroot said:

There are similar cuts for child welfare. I totaled up a few of these figures on the three programs for the States. There would be a total cut, for instance, of about \$20,000, roughly, for New Mexico, and other States, in proportion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that the figures indicate that this would mean serious curtailment of services and it does not seem to me good economy—

I stress this point—

to let crippled children go with their conditions uncared for when a little work now would prevent, perhaps, a much more serious condition a little bit later, or to let the very high infant-mortality rates in some of the States go without everything possible being done to lower those rates and bring them down to the national average.

Mr. President, these are most serious matters. We try to prepare our children so that in case of necessity or emergency they will be able to make the supreme sacrifice, if need be, and thus be the recipients of nothing more than white crosses over their graves. Yet, by means of this amendment, it is proposed that on the basis of—may I say, measly advice?—we make reductions in the funds to be appropriated for maternal care and the care of crippled children.

Mr. President, a portion of the funds to be appropriated in this connection are to be used to reduce the infant mor-

tal rate. Millions and millions of dollars are appropriated by the Congress to eradicate Bang's disease in cattle, but complaint is made because we try to make a small appropriation—certainly it is very small when compared with the total appropriations which are made—to reduce infant mortality.

I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. What right have we to sermonize to people behind the iron curtain, when we do not do anything about infant mortality, which, in itself, is quite a serious problem?

But I shall proceed with the reading of the testimony of that noble woman. Let those who wish to call her a bureaucrat do so. I refer to Miss Katharine F. Lenroot. She works for the Government, and I wish there were more Government employees of her type. From page 527 of the hearings, I read:

Senator CHAVEZ. We have the national picture very well, but for the benefit of the Senator from Montana, I wish you would briefly explain again why the House cut that \$3,000,000 because some of the States had balances.

Miss LENROOT. I shall be glad to do that, Senator ECTON.

Senator ECTON. Thank you.

Miss LENROOT. The provisions of the Social Security Act regarding maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare—

Possibly they do not deserve our consideration. The committee thought they did, and I believe the red-blooded Americans in this body, who are lovers of humanity, will feel the same way about it. I continue reading—

provide that the States can carry over a part of the fund for 2 years beyond the year for which they are appropriated.

That has been of value to the States in giving continuity to their planning. In reducing the amount for grants from \$33,000,000 as recommended by the budget to \$30,000,000, the House said there was \$3,000,000 already available to the States in balances, but those are very unevenly distributed. About 28 States have no balance or less than \$1,000 for maternal and child-health services; about 43 States have no balance or less than \$1,000 for crippled children's services.

Senator ECTON. There is no way to reallocate?

That is the problem. There is no way to allocate an allotment made to the State of North Carolina, or to the State of Arkansas, the State of Georgia, the State of Alabama, the State of Wyoming, the State of Arizona, or the State of New York. The money cannot be used in North Carolina for maternal and child health, and the other purposes, no matter how much the State may need it.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. I notice that the committee has stricken out the proviso on page 32, lines 11 to 15, which provided that this money should be allotted on a pro rata basis among the several States. Why was that stricken out?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was done in order to obtain a more equitable distribution of the allotments to the respective States. It was a question of policy. It was a question of whether, under one

formula, one State might obtain a slight advantage over another State. What the committee did was to try to assure that the allocations would be made as equitably as possible, so that every State might receive its proportionate share.

Mr. HOEY. It appears that under the present plans the money has been allotted on a pro rata basis. The committee would strike that out. Upon what basis is it to be allotted?

Mr. HILL. If I may answer the Senator's question, striking out that language leaves the law just as Congress has written it, exactly as the distinguished Senator's committee reported it, and exactly as we agreed to it in the last Social Security Act. The purpose of that act was to change the existing law, I may say to the Senator and, by striking the language out, we leave the law as it is now, under the basic Social Security Act, as reported by the committee of which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is chairman, and as passed by the Congress.

Mr. HOEY. Upon what basis is it distributed under that law? The language of the bill as it came to the Senate says it shall be upon the basis of the amounts to which the respective States are entitled, and so forth. Upon what basis will it be distributed under the committee amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall endeavor to explain that to the Senator in a moment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, by striking out that language we declined to do away with the statutory minimum which is written into the basic act.

Mr. HOEY. When the State gets its pro rata share, upon what basis does it get it, if this language is stricken out?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator kindly let the Senator from New Mexico proceed with his explanation, and give us time to get this information?

Mr. HOEY. Very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my understanding that for the fiscal year 1950 this type of work received a total of \$22,000,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The statement of comparable adjusted funds available for the fiscal years 1941-52 appears on page 190.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have that page.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In 1950, the agency received \$22,000,000. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the committee's proposal would give them \$33,000,000, or an increase of 50 percent. The hard-hearted proposal of the Senator from Illinois, to give them \$30,000,000, is an increase of but 40 percent, plus the unexpended balances in 20 States, is it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. But, Mr. President, I may say that what is proposed is not only possible, but it is also sound. Since the Congress made the appropriation for

1950 it has changed the law with reference to that particular item, hence it is necessary that the increase be made. But the Senate committee is not recommending 1 penny more than was estimated by the Budget Bureau. We increase this particular item for the Children's Bureau only \$3,000,000. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to express my opposition to the amendment. I realize that some agencies of the Government are overstaffed, indeed, three-fourths of them are overstaffed. There are some, however, which have tried to operate efficiently and economically all through the years. I do not like indiscriminate cuts in appropriations, because they hurt not only those who have done good work, but those who have tried to do so. I think this is a very bad program by which to effect economies. "Pogrom" I think the proper word would be. Maybe it is "program," but I do not think so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I like the remarks of the Senator from Vermont. I should like to cut appropriations for unnecessary automobiles, unnecessary chauffeurs, or unnecessary personnel. But let us be fair. This is one agency of the Federal Government which, as I stated previously, is headed by a noble person. Yes, she might be referred to as a bureaucrat, but I wish there were more of her type of bureaucrats. This item should not be cut one penny.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct about that. I think we were perfectly right in limiting the number of automobiles and chauffeurs and there are also many other places in the bill where we can make cuts. We should use proper care in watching the expenditures of the so-called temporary agencies of Government, because in the provisions relating to those agencies much can be done both economically and politically, and much more can be done advantageously than in cutting the older and conscientious agencies of the Government. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to reply briefly to the question raised by the senior Senator from Illinois, who pointed out that the total appropriation for the care of crippled children had increased at this time to \$22,000,000. I wish to point out that this is a matching proposition. The Federal Government matches appropriations made by the States.

The whole concept of maternal care, the care of children and of crippled children, has changed and advanced in the past 10, 15, or 20 years. When I became Governor of New York there was virtually no provision for the care of crippled children. Gradually that work was undertaken, because it was demonstrated to be of tremendous value to the people not only of New York State, but of the Nation generally. Therefore the

work has increased in volume, and the appropriations necessarily have increased very greatly in size.

The cost of government by the States, largely because of fulfilling their necessary and essential duties toward their people, has increased. During the last year I was Governor the budget of the State of New York was under \$400,000,000. Last year it was nearly a billion dollars. I do not claim for a minute that that great increase was due to wastefulness, or to a desire to undertake activities which were not essential in the interests of the people. The budget increase was in excess of 150 percent because of the general increase in the cost of operation, not only in government, but in private business as well, throughout the country.

The appropriations made for hospitals in New York increased from \$50,000,000 to approximately \$140,000,000. I do not think there has been any greater waste under the present administration in Albany than there was under my administration. The appropriations increased because the needs were present, because costs were higher, and because salaries were higher. Of course, we felt that it was the duty of government to care for its people.

So the increase which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has pointed out has come about normally. It is not a real increase; it is merely to meet the increased cost of operation and the increased needs of our people. The \$33,000,000 which I hope will be appropriated this year will not permit the States to do a single piece of work larger in scope than that which was performed this year. It would simply permit the carrying on of the work on the same scale, at the same tempo, and under the same necessity, as in the past year.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not lessen our ability to help the mothers and the crippled children in every State of the Union by trying to save a small sum of money. We are spending great sums of money for our Armed Forces. I have voted and shall continue to vote for every defense measure. But do not let our social and health activities be neglected simply to save a small sum of money.

I very much hope that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois will be rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the term "carry-over," in describing the sum of \$3,000,000, is a misnomer. It requires explanation. It is not a carry-over. There is no criticism of the Senator from Illinois in my statement. He made a very fine speech, and I concur in what he had to say. It is not a carry-over as to the majority of the States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a carry-over as to 20 of the States, is it not?

Mr. HILL. That depends upon the particular item. It would be a carry-over for 20 States out of the 48 States, so far as maternal and child health services are concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So those States which will next year service not only the amount appropriated by the pending bill, but will also have unexpended amounts appropriated for the past year, are in effect being provided with more than \$33,000,000 for the coming year, are they not?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. We make those funds available for a period of 2 years, and there is a reason for that. As we know, the use of these funds depends upon action by State legislatures, as well as on action by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. If the Congress permitted itself to be controlled in the amount it appropriated by the extent to which one or more States had not used a previous appropriation, would it then follow that the States which have been carrying the program forward on the basis of congressional authorization should be limited to what the State which has spent the least was able to do?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct in his implication. If we followed such a course, and put a heavy penalty on the States which are going forward with the program, and who are putting up their funds and making their sacrifices to carry forward the program we would be unjustly penalizing them.

Mr. KERR. In other words, the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would be to cripple the States which are carrying out the program, and which most nearly do what is required by the necessities of their children.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. It would cripple and penalize the States which in good faith have gone forward with what the Congress has said was the kind of program we should follow in providing for maternal care and for our children.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. A short time ago the Senator from Alabama was engaged in a colloquy with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. I do not believe the question then raised was cleared up.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Kansas permit me to proceed with the other phase? I will say that since that colloquy I have conferred with the chairman of the subcommittee and also with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is a member of the committee, and before the debate is concluded we propose to clear up the matter.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator will do that I shall appreciate it very much, because I have had some experience in handling programs of this nature.

Mr. HILL. The Senator, as a former distinguished governor of his State has, as he has said, had personal knowledge of the handling of these programs.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is familiar with the report made recently by the Institute of Public Affairs, which is constituted entirely of Democrats, among whose members are the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and a son of former President Roosevelt, and whose director is Dewey Anderson. The director reported that there are 10,000,000 families in the United States having an income of less than \$2,000 a year. Would not the Senator say that the bill is designed to help those particular families?

Mr. HILL. Very definitely so. No bill could have a more definite purpose toward helping those in the low-income groups than the bill now before us, I will say to my distinguished friend from North Dakota.

Mr. President, 28 States have carried the program forward by putting up funds of their own, by carrying their part of the financial burden. They have carried on what the Congress has prescribed as adequate programs for maternal and child health services. The question is: Are we to penalize those 28 States because 20 States have not gone forward as we feel they should have gone forward with their programs?

Forty-three States have to the fullest extent gone forward with their programs for crippled children's services. Are we now to take money away from these 43 States because 5 of the States have not seen fit—as they had a right to do—to go forward with the full program? That is the question involved here. These States have their programs. We know what the basic Social Security Act provides so far as Federal aid is concerned. They know what we did this year. I think they have a right to expect that we will not cripple or impair or paralyze these programs for next year. That is exactly what the amendment of my distinguished friend from Illinois would do.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. Yes, I yield to my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. As brought out by the committee, the bill provides a total of \$33,000,000 Federal funds for the 3 services, for child welfare services, for maternal and child health services, and for crippled children's services. A total of \$33,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that that amount, \$33,000,000, is approximately \$3,000,000 less than the amount for these three services which was authorized by the Eighty-first Congress?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct. He is a distinguished member of the Senate Committee on Finance. That was the committee which handled the legislation embodying the amendments to the Social Security Act, which amendments authorized the additional \$8,000,000.

Mr. KERR. If the Senate keeps the bill, as reported by the committee, at the sum of \$33,000,000, that will represent an amount \$7,951,800 less than the amount for these three programs which

at this time is authorized by the acts of Congress.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oklahoma is exactly correct, and I thank him for his contribution. I do not know of any Senator who has been more interested in the work of the Children's Bureau, or has done more to help that Bureau, or to further or to strengthen and fortify these great child-welfare programs, than has the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, on last Friday the Senate heard one of the most eloquent and moving speeches that certainly I have heard in my somewhat long service on this floor. I refer to the speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. We recall that in that speech he asked us to assess the value of a child, the value of a healthy mother as compared to a sickly one, the value of a crippled child put back in the main stream of human effort instead of lying all of his life staring at the ceiling. Since the Senator from Vermont asked the value of a child, let us pause for a moment to think of its value. It is difficult to assess. It is particularly hard to assess that value in terms of dollars and cents. But it is not hard to estimate the value of children in the eyes of the people of the United States.

In March the census dazed us by reporting that in the decade from 1940 to 1950 the population of children under 5 years of age increased by 54 percent. That is the largest increase of any element of our population. In these past years, when we have endured war, anxiety, sudden death, long family separations, this increase in our children has been America's affirmation of life. It is as if America wanted to underscore the belief that she has a future by increasing the number of children by more than 50 percent, taking on the emotional burdens, the financial burdens, the long-term planning, the sacrifices that go with the care of the young.

Merely considering the past 5 years, that is, from 1945 to 1950, a grand total of over 20,000,000 children have been born in the United States. From a statistical standpoint at least one-fourth of these children were unexpected when we consider the birth rate of 10 years ago. Sometimes on some matters we are not entirely certain as to the drift of the sentiment of the people of our country. I think the 5-year birth rate of 20,000,000 is sufficient answer as to whether or not the American people feel that our children are important.

The Children's Bureau, which is the agency of our Federal Government which serves our children, has been given many increased duties and functions in recent years. I referred a few minutes ago to the amendments to the Social Security Act which Congress passed about a year and a half ago. That act imposed new duties, new functions, on the Children's Bureau.

The Senate has already, Mr. President, as we know, made two 5-percent cuts in the appropriations for the personnel of the Children's Bureau. We have already cut off 10 percent, so far

as the personnel for the Children's Bureau is concerned. Now the amendment of the Senator from Illinois proposes that we whack off \$3,000,000 from the funds that go as aid to the States for carrying forward these great programs for children.

Where do these cuts lead us? Where do they end? They end with much slower progress in the work for crippled children throughout the country. Today there are some 31,400 crippled children on State waiting lists. They are children who cannot receive any care, children who cannot receive any rehabilitation, children who cannot receive any medical attention. All they can do is to wait, because the funds are not available to provide personnel and equipment to go forward with their care and rehabilitation.

These cuts will mean reductions in the various offices in the States and in State-employed personnel. They will mean a reduction in the ranks of medical directors in small cities, public-health nurses, and social workers. The result will be that the compelling need for the care of our children can no longer be met. Special programs for children with rheumatic heart disease will be impaired. The cerebral palsy program for our children, the program for epileptics, and other such programs will be impaired, slowed down, and cut off in much of their work and benefits. As I have said, these cuts will eliminate specially trained people, pediatrically trained doctors and nurses. Heaven knows, today there is the most acute shortage the country has ever known in this type of personnel. We are getting along with far less today than the compulsion of the need requires.

Mr. President, we hear much about the emergency which confronts us. We all share a deep concern with respect to expenditures and a deep desire to cut down expenditures wherever they can be wisely and properly cut down. But we do not know how long this emergency may last. It may last 5 years, 10 years, or 20 years.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend.

Mr. KERR. On the basis of the statement just made, which I think is well founded and in accordance with the very distinct probabilities, is it not a fact that, as we look forward to the time 10 or 15 years from now, we look forward to the time when children now in the age brackets which make them eligible for this help will be the ones upon whom the survival of the Nation will depend?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. In fact, the Senator has anticipated me, and has expressed much better, I am sure, than I would have expressed it, the very thought which I had in mind and was about to give expression to.

I intended also to make the point that we can dismantle a factory and put the machinery away, properly grease it and care for it, or we can put the Navy in moth balls; but we cannot put our children in moth balls. We cannot reclaim

the golden minutes if we lose them today.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the Senator from Alabama if he thinks that it would be easier to obtain an adequate appropriation if we were dealing with a piece of machinery?

Mr. HILL. I think the RECORD will show that the Senator's question answers itself. Very likely, if we were considering a piece of machinery, we would not have the same difficulty we are having in trying to get funds for the care of our children.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. On the basis of experience, has it not been demonstrated that it is often easier to get an appropriation to improve the blood stream of a bull than it is to provide adequate funds for the prevention of deterioration and delinquency in youth?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. A little earlier in the debate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], cited figures to show how much more money is going for bulls, cows, heifers, and other animals, and for plants of all kinds, than we are able to get for our most precious possession, our children, our citizens of tomorrow, as the Senator from Oklahoma has stated.

A child will not remain static. A child continues to grow. Either we give the child the opportunity now for a healthy, strong, normal body, and the opportunity now to develop into a strong and healthy citizen, or the opportunity is lost and gone forever.

Mr. President, I very much hope that the Senate, in emphatic fashion, will vote this amendment down, and that we can send back to our people in the States the message that the Congress keeps faith with the States, keeps faith with our children, and that we are going to continue to provide the funds necessary to carry forward these great programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 32, line 6.

Mr. LEHMAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am happy to align myself with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and other Senators who are opposed to the so-called Douglas amendment to reduce by \$3,000,000 the appropriation for the child welfare services, the maternal and child health services, and the crippled children's services.

The requirements and necessities for this money are on the increase; they are

not on the decrease. As the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has just reminded us, for the past few years our Nation has seen the greatest increase in the birth rate it has ever known. In 1947, births in this country exceeded the staggering total of 4,000,000. Even today, the increase in the birth rate is being reflected in the greatly increased requirements of our schools and of every other facility in our Nation having to do with the training and care of youth. My information is that for the last part of 1950 and the first part of 1951 the birth rate has again increased, to the point where it is entirely probable that the all-time record of approximately 4,000,000 in 1947 will be exceeded in 1951.

In the last Congress authorization was given for a little more than \$40,000,000 for these three services. That was a great increase in the amount of Federal funds provided for these services.

The Senator from Illinois has called attention to the fact that some of the States have not used all the funds previously appropriated. The State of Oklahoma is one of the States. My information is that the State of Oklahoma even now has its program in operation to the point where the remaining amount of the appropriation will be available in the succeeding fiscal year and where there will be a deficit even on the basis of a \$33,000,000 appropriation being made.

I think the Senator will find that in a number of States, by reason of the greatly increased appropriation last year, the State programs have not yet quite caught up, either with the tempo of the needs for the program within the States or with the amount made available by the Federal Government. I believe that such a situation is short-lived. I hesitate to think how tragic it would be if, by reason of the Federal Government's failure to provide the funds which it had indicated it would provide by the authorization of the Eighty-first Congress, there should come to our attention, as I believe there surely would, a great increase in the number of children who could not be reached because of limited funds.

Mr. President, this is the greatest nation on the earth. It is the strongest and the richest nation on the earth. It has attained that distinction because of the abundance of its natural resources and the character and quality of its people. We are now in the midst of the graduation season of our colleges and universities. It has been my privilege to attend a few such exercises during the past weeks. It has been a tremendous thrill to me to see the thousands of American youth coming from our colleges and universities through their graduation and moving into the bloodstream of the Nation. It is a source of great pride and gratification to learn that between 450,000 and 500,000 young Americans will graduate this year from our colleges and universities. What a transfusion of strength and power it will be as they move into the bloodstream of the Nation and make their contributions of physical

courage, mental ability, and spiritual character. I do not believe that all the universities and colleges in the world outside of our Nation will graduate so great a number this year. I know of no fact more reassuring, as we contemplated the troubled condition of the world and the crises we face, than to realize the tremendous increase in spiritual and mental power provided by the ever greater numbers of American youth.

Mr. President, on the basis of the birth rate in this country for the past 6 years and on the basis of the increased opportunities and necessities for education, I believe it is entirely possible that within a decade we shall see American colleges and universities graduating a million youth every year. However, there will be hundreds of thousands of them who will not be graduated if the Nation fails to meet its responsibilities to them in the form of a greater educational program and in the form of such programs with reference to which the appropriation is being made available. The future strength and power of the Nation will be as great as the mental and moral and spiritual forces of our people make it.

We have surpassed the world in scientific development and industrial progress. We have surpassed the world in the matter of the utilization of resources for constructive and beneficial purposes. But the future of the Nation and the future of the world depend upon the generation of American youth of this day.

The appropriation in the amount of \$33,000,000 is inadequate. It is not excessive. It is tragic to contemplate a drastic arbitrary reduction on the basis of a hypothesis which does not exist, and in spite of the definite realities of the situation as the situation does exist. I

believe it is tragic that the appropriation is not in the amount of \$40,000,000 or \$41,000,000, as authorized by the Eighty-first Congress. It was not an ill-conceived act by the committees of the two Houses of Congress. It was action which was taken after the fullest consideration had been given to the subject and after the fullest presentation had been made of the pertinent facts. The action of the committee in recommending an appropriation of \$33,000,000 was not one which was hastily taken or taken in the absence of knowledge. It was taken by the committee after it had given consideration to the facts as they had been presented to it.

Mr. President, America would be doing herself an injustice, and she would be doing her future an injustice, if the reduction were made. Over and beyond that, Mr. President, she would, in the midst of her greatest prosperity and strength and in the midst of her greatest need for the fullest development of her youth, be taking an action which would be penny-wise and pound-foolish and detrimental in the extreme to her youth. To the extent that she damaged them she would certainly damage herself. A continuation and an expansion of the policy in the name of economy could bring about a weakening of the fiber of America to her very destruction.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as the temporary acting leader of the minority which is the Republican Party I desire to associate myself fully and entirely and completely with each and every one of the words spoken by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I think it is one of the finest speeches I have ever heard made on the floor of the Senate insofar as it pertains

to the youth of this country. It was a clear, succinct, patriotic, and statesman-like summing up of all that is involved in the pending amendment.

A few years ago in the State of North Dakota, during the years of the depression, the Bank of North Dakota made a fund of \$150,000 available to graduates of our high schools who because of their financial status were unable to go to college. We made the money available in loans of \$300 a year at 1 percent interest, payable some years after they graduated and were able to repay the money. I may say that today the record shows that 96 percent of that money has been returned to the Bank of North Dakota by these young men and women, who became school teachers, doctors, lawyers, and leaders in agriculture.

I find that in my State we have had a remarkably fine record insofar as the administration of child welfare services and crippled children's services and maternal and child-care services are concerned. And the people of North Dakota are justly proud of those who have often sacrificed money, time, and opportunity to get better positions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, two tables giving the apportionment of total funds estimated to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1951 for grants to States for maternal and child health, crippled children's, and child-welfare services. I call particular attention to North Dakota's position on the schedule and the fact that the State matched the Federal funds.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Apportionment of total funds estimated to be appropriated for fiscal year 1951 for grants to States for maternal and child health, crippled children's and child-welfare services

State	Total available to States, 1951	Maternal and child health services			Crippled children's services			Child welfare services, total available to States, 1951
		Total available to States, 1951	Total available to States, 1951, fund A	Total available to States, 1951, fund B	Total available to States, 1951	Total available to States, 1951, fund A	Total available to States, 1951, fund B	
Alabama.....	\$1,128,237	\$504,323	\$151,079	\$353,244	\$338,546	\$116,475	\$222,071	\$285,368
Alaska.....	298,144	117,260	57,260	60,000	123,947	53,947	70,000	56,937
Arizona.....	360,215	173,118	98,118	75,000	107,320	87,320	20,000	79,777
Arkansas.....	814,604	309,316	119,153	190,163	254,319	93,599	160,720	251,269
California.....	1,015,055	456,313	328,166	128,147	295,127	211,309	83,818	263,615
Colorado.....	440,555	218,353	91,383	127,000	93,925	73,925	20,000	128,247
Connecticut.....	460,944	126,894	101,894	25,000	194,926	92,666	102,260	139,124
Delaware.....	288,217	112,908	79,908	33,000	120,810	100,310	20,000	54,999
District of Columbia.....	349,284	117,480	77,480	40,000	185,533	65,533	120,000	46,271
Florida.....	569,957	253,198	121,698	131,500	145,029	95,198	49,831	171,730
Georgia.....	1,120,413	488,304	189,427	328,877	285,411	119,571	165,840	346,698
Hawaii.....	363,669	190,239	70,239	60,000	163,938	63,938	100,000	69,492
Idaho.....	322,347	97,141	72,141	25,000	83,088	63,088	20,000	142,118
Illinois.....	973,082	297,770	264,515	33,255	280,345	189,281	91,061	394,667
Indiana.....	825,553	315,331	188,940	126,391	193,770	119,919	73,851	316,452
Iowa.....	701,049	321,395	232,678	88,717	195,702	97,839	97,863	183,952
Kansas.....	428,880	147,765	102,447	45,318	118,557	85,499	33,058	162,558
Kentucky.....	994,419	414,383	141,736	272,647	296,864	111,130	185,734	288,172
Louisiana.....	843,778	381,362	137,330	244,032	243,495	105,935	137,560	218,921
Maine.....	348,440	146,708	100,021	46,687	111,029	68,929	43,000	89,803
Maryland.....	841,153	418,847	114,656	304,191	208,204	90,204	208,000	124,102
Massachusetts.....	658,977	316,752	164,780	151,972	232,381	126,261	106,120	109,844
Michigan.....	1,022,773	446,579	250,060	196,519	293,728	162,768	130,960	277,466
Minnesota.....	666,127	239,491	139,302	100,189	217,896	104,059	113,837	198,740
Balances from prior years.....								
Appropriation prior to enactment H. R. 6000.....					\$3,078,724	\$870,518	\$294,286	\$1,913,920
Supplemental appropriation requested under H. R. 6000.....					22,000,000	11,000,000	7,500,000	3,500,000
					11,250,000	3,000,000	3,375,000	4,875,000
Total.....					36,328,724	14,870,518	11,169,286	10,288,920

Apportionment of total funds estimated to be appropriated for fiscal year 1951 for grants to States for maternal and child health, crippled children's and child-welfare services—Continued

State	Total available to States, 1951	Maternal and child health services			Crippled children's services			Child welfare services, total available to States, 1951
		Total available to States, 1951	Total available to States, 1951, fund A	Total available to States, 1951, fund B	Total available to States, 1951	Total available to States, 1951, fund A	Total available to States, 1951, fund B	
Mississippi	\$924,800	\$357,431	\$128,200	\$229,231	\$296,735	\$100,242	\$196,493	\$270,634
Missouri	768,958	309,160	190,124	119,036	239,685	118,522	121,163	220,113
Montana	324,635	139,843	114,843	25,000	107,177	62,177	45,000	77,615
Nebraska	471,357	161,371	111,219	50,152	124,972	74,972	50,000	185,014
Nevada	343,426	160,153	135,153	25,000	137,590	117,590	20,000	45,683
New Hampshire	270,928	93,136	68,136	25,000	118,296	98,296	20,000	59,496
New Jersey	616,118	231,935	206,935	25,000	224,214	124,214	100,000	159,969
New Mexico	309,518	132,146	77,146	55,000	85,940	65,940	20,000	91,432
New York	1,292,994	468,025	398,025	70,000	420,921	268,341	152,580	404,048
North Carolina	1,393,790	564,061	178,507	385,554	396,481	133,703	262,778	433,248
North Dakota	312,502	97,835	72,835	25,000	83,887	63,887	20,000	130,780
Ohio	1,156,712	442,498	271,580	170,918	282,753	182,501	100,252	431,461
Oklahoma	754,115	257,086	163,297	93,789	261,831	98,094	163,737	235,198
Oregon	351,026	125,471	93,887	31,584	98,269	78,269	20,000	127,286
Pennsylvania	1,461,371	573,897	316,101	257,796	412,890	230,536	182,354	474,581
Puerto Rico	966,307	427,976	153,858	274,118	284,861	110,129	174,732	253,470
Rhode Island	322,670	115,960	90,960	25,000	150,804	89,804	70,000	47,906
South Carolina	805,240	287,399	119,599	167,800	273,720	98,994	174,726	244,121
South Dakota	404,929	187,531	162,531	25,000	92,137	64,137	28,000	125,261
Tennessee	1,073,429	484,965	147,380	337,585	287,352	117,372	169,980	301,112
Texas	1,549,674	638,119	390,716	337,403	483,641	194,428	289,213	427,914
Utah	338,050	148,619	98,619	50,000	116,633	66,633	50,000	72,798
Vermont	264,025	90,378	65,378	25,000	105,111	85,111	20,000	68,536
Virgin Islands	201,933	80,923	55,923	25,000	74,790	54,790	20,000	46,220
Virginia	977,190	367,842	169,562	198,280	290,880	115,185	175,695	318,468
Washington	484,488	206,486	117,403	89,083	167,281	92,652	74,629	110,721
West Virginia	674,456	272,536	121,146	151,390	176,880	93,012	83,868	225,040
Wisconsin	791,145	334,225	231,143	103,082	242,085	110,429	131,656	214,835
Wyoming	404,376	170,901	145,901	25,000	143,140	123,140	20,000	90,335
Unapportioned reserve fund B	491,390	391,350		391,350	100,040		100,040	
Total	36,328,724	14,870,518	7,870,518	7,000,000	11,169,286	5,731,786	5,437,500	10,288,920

Apportionment of total funds estimated to be appropriated for fiscal year 1951 for grants to States for maternal and child health, crippled children's and child-welfare services

	Maternal and child health services	Crippled children's services	Child welfare services
Balances from prior years			
Appropriation prior to enactment H. R. 6000	\$870,518	\$294,286	\$1,913,920
Supplemental appropriation requested under H. R. 6000	11,000,000	7,500,000	3,500,000
	3,000,000	3,375,000	4,875,000
Total	14,870,518	11,169,286	10,288,920

State	Maternal and child health services				Crippled children's services				Child welfare services		
	Total available to States, 1951	Apportionment 1951 exclusive of reserve fund B	Apportionment 1951 reserve fund B ¹	Prior years' balances available in 1951	Total available to States, 1951	Apportionment 1951 exclusive of reserve fund B	Apportionment 1951 reserve fund B ²	Prior years' balances available in 1951	Total available to States, 1951	Apportionment, 1951	Prior years' balances available in 1951
Alabama	\$504,323	\$404,323	\$100,000		\$338,546	\$288,196	\$50,000	\$350	\$285,368	\$285,321	\$47
Alaska	117,260	82,260	35,000		123,947	73,947	50,000		56,937	45,848	11,089
Arizona	172,118	100,633	50,000	\$22,485	107,320	86,434		20,836	79,777	77,643	2,341
Arkansas	309,316	246,177	52,500	10,639	254,319	204,319	50,000		251,269	213,443	32,826
California	456,313	421,313	35,000		295,127	269,627	25,500		263,615	212,945	50,670
Colorado	218,383	116,383	102,000		93,925	93,923		2	128,247	93,520	31,727
Connecticut	126,894	126,894			194,926	104,063	82,260	8,603	139,124	83,810	55,314
Delaware	112,908	87,020	8,000	17,888	120,310	77,545		42,765	54,999	51,265	3,734
District of Columbia	117,480	102,480	15,000		185,533	85,533	100,000		46,271	40,000	6,271
Florida	253,198	203,198	50,000		145,029	145,029			171,730	130,228	41,502
Georgia	488,304	413,304	75,000		285,411	285,411			346,658	284,345	62,353
Hawaii	130,239	95,239	35,000		163,938	83,938	80,000		69,492	61,398	8,094
Idaho	97,141	97,141			83,088	83,088			142,118	77,342	64,776
Illinois	297,770	297,770			280,345	212,499	67,200	646	394,967	223,976	165,991
Indiana	315,331	273,630	12,000	29,701	193,770	193,770			316,452	1,522	131,930
Iowa	321,395	211,526		109,869	195,702	158,657	42,000	45	183,952	77,760	6,192
Kansas	147,765	147,765			118,557	118,469		88	162,558	7,609	24,949
Kentucky	414,383	374,383	40,000		296,864	266,864	30,000		283,172	76,570	6,602
Louisiana	381,362	306,362	75,000		243,495	220,755	22,740		218,921	195,639	13,282
Maine	146,708	105,599	20,000	21,109	111,929	88,929	23,000		89,803	39,671	132
Maryland	418,847	155,669	263,178		298,204	110,204	188,000		124,102	111,614	12,488
Massachusetts	316,752	189,780	126,972		232,381	146,261	86,120		109,844	77,730	32,114
Michigan	446,579	376,671	50,000	19,908	298,728	248,728	50,000		277,466	218,074	58,492
Minnesota	239,491	236,913		2,578	217,896	137,896	50,000		198,740	180,068	18,672
Mississippi	357,431	357,431			296,735	246,735	50,000		270,634	253,339	17,295
Missouri	309,160	269,186	800	39,174	239,685	209,685	30,000		220,113	218,449	1,664
Montana	139,843	95,891		43,952	107,177	31,939	25,000	238	77,615	74,171	3,444
Nebraska	161,371	119,445	20,000	21,925	124,972	94,972	30,000		185,014	118,119	66,895
Nevada	160,153	82,961		77,192	137,590	75,046		62,544	45,683	45,655	28
New Hampshire	93,136	92,913			118,296	81,540		36,756	59,496	57,846	1,650
New Jersey	231,935	189,997		41,938	224,214	144,214	80,000		159,969	102,319	57,650
New Mexico	132,146	102,143	30,000	3	85,940	85,783		157	91,432	85,649	5,783
New York	468,025	423,010	45,000	15	420,921	283,341	132,580		404,048	233,473	170,575
North Carolina	564,061	534,061	30,000		396,481	361,481	35,000		433,248	362,170	71,078
North Dakota	97,835	97,835		178	83,887	83,887			130,780	95,788	34,992
Ohio	442,498	423,822	13,800	5,376	282,753	282,598		155	431,461	257,981	173,480
Oklahoma	257,086	204,982	52,104		261,831	191,271	70,560		235,198	207,772	27,426
Oregon	125,471	125,471			98,269	98,269			127,286	89,727	37,559
Pennsylvania	573,897	570,599		3,298	412,890	412,890			474,584	375,768	98,816
Puerto Rico	427,976	427,976			284,861	284,861			253,470	229,871	23,599

Footnotes at end of table.

Apportionment of total funds estimated to be appropriated for fiscal year 1951 for grants to States for maternal and child health, crippled children's and child-welfare services—Continued

State	Maternal and child health services				Crippled children's services				Child welfare services		
	Total available to States, 1951	Apportionment 1951 exclusive of reserve fund B	Apportionment 1951 reserve fund B ¹	Prior years' balances available in 1951	Total available to States, 1951	Apportionment 1951 exclusive of reserve fund B	Apportionment 1951 reserve fund B ²	Prior years' balances available in 1951	Total available to States, 1951	Apportionment, 1951	Prior years' balances available in 1951
Rhode Island.....	\$115,960	\$97,973	-----	\$17,987	\$159,804	\$84,437	\$50,000	\$25,367	\$47,906	\$45,179	\$2,727
South Carolina.....	287,399	287,399	-----	-----	273,720	223,720	50,000	-----	244,121	223,334	20,787
South Dakota.....	187,531	97,453	-----	90,078	92,137	84,137	8,000	-----	125,261	90,290	34,971
Tennessee.....	484,965	365,065	\$119,900	-----	287,352	275,352	12,000	-----	301,112	257,887	43,225
Texas.....	638,119	616,601	-----	21,518	483,641	483,641	-----	-----	427,914	427,848	66
Utah.....	148,619	102,365	25,000	21,254	116,633	86,633	30,000	-----	72,798	70,487	2,311
Vermont.....	90,378	89,431	-----	947	105,111	79,291	-----	25,820	68,536	62,818	5,718
Virgin Islands.....	80,923	79,692	-----	1,231	74,790	73,089	-----	1,701	46,220	40,882	5,338
Virginia.....	367,842	345,580	-----	22,262	290,880	238,272	50,000	-----	318,468	238,102	80,366
Washington.....	206,486	156,486	50,000	-----	167,281	117,281	50,000	-----	110,721	110,719	2
West Virginia.....	272,536	244,875	20,000	7,661	176,880	176,870	-----	10	225,040	206,064	18,976
Wisconsin.....	334,225	249,895	-----	84,330	242,085	167,085	75,000	-----	214,835	183,521	31,314
Wyoming.....	170,901	87,207	-----	83,694	143,140	77,545	-----	65,595	90,335	55,531	34,804
Unapportioned reserve fund B.....	391,350	-----	391,350	-----	100,040	-----	100,040	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	14,870,518	12,110,000	1,890,000	870,518	11,169,286	9,000,000	1,875,000	294,286	10,288,920	8,375,000	1,913,920

¹ These allocations are for special projects of Nation-wide significance that will contribute to the development of maternal and child health programs in all States. They represent amounts of less than \$100,000 in all except 5 States. These States are as follows: Alabama, special medical and hospital care project; Colorado, project for care of premature infants; Maryland, projects for premature infants, training of maternal and child health personnel, demonstration of comprehensive county maternal and child health program; Massachusetts, training of maternal and child health personnel and children's dental health; Tennessee, training maternal and child health personnel. (Students from a number of States attend training programs.)

² These allocations are for special projects of Nation-wide significance that will contribute to the development of crippled children's programs in all States. They represent amounts of less than \$100,000 in all except 3 States which are as follows: District of Columbia, rheumatic fever and pediatric care projects; Maryland, projects for cerebral palsy, rheumatic fever, hearing, and training of personnel for crippled children's programs; New York, rheumatic fever and training of personnel for services to crippled children.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at this time I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for the fine, enlightened, and courageous fight he has made in behalf of those who, more than anyone else, need help. In the United States there are 10,000,000 families having incomes of less than \$2,000 a year. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico has become their spokesman on this floor. Words on my part would be entirely inadequate to express to the Senator from New Mexico the thanks not only of the North Dakota families who come in that bracket, but also of all those in the entire United States and in the Territories. In their behalf I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	McFarland
Anderson	Green	McKellar
Bennett	Hendrickson	McMahon
Brewster	Hennings	Monroney
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Moody
Bridges	Hill	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Neely
Byrd	Humphrey	Nixon
Capehart	Hunt	O'Connor
Carlson	Ives	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Jenner	Pastore
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dworschak	Kilgore	Stennis
Eastland	Knowland	Taft
Ecton	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Tobey
Ferguson	Long	Underwood
Flanders	Magnuson	Welker
Frear	Maybank	Wherry
Fulbright	McCarran	Williams
George	McCarthy	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "O" of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall oppose the Douglas amendment. Only last year the Social Security Act was reconsidered. We increased the amount of the authorization in the item under consideration because we did not think the amount provided was sufficient to carry on the work required in connection with maternal health, crippled children, and child welfare. In my opinion this is not a field in which we should cut the allowances. It is a field in which the Federal Government to a very limited extent helps various programs primarily for the benefit of children. I am quite willing to have the appropriations in the bill cut, but I do not believe the economy sought in the pending amendment is justified under the circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "O" of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. LANGER and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas is unavoidably detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor

Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—17

Bennett	Douglas	Robertson
Bricker	Ecton	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Ferguson	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Wherry
Byrd	Jenner	Williams
Capehart	O'Connor	

NAYS—61

Alken	Hill	McKellar
Anderson	Hoey	McMahon
Brewster	Holland	Monroney
Bridges	Humphrey	Moody
Carlson	Hunt	Morse
Chavez	Ives	Mundt
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Cordon	Johnston, S. O.	O'Mahoney
Duff	Kefauver	Pastore
Dworshak	Kerr	Russell
Eastland	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Ellender	Knowland	Stennis
Flanders	Langer	Taft
Frear	Lehman	Thye
Fulbright	Long	Tobey
George	Magnuson	Underwood
Gillette	Maybank	Welker
Green	McCarran	Young
Hennings	McCarthy	
Hickenlooper	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—18

Benton	Lodge	Schoeppel
Cain	Malone	Smathers
Case	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	McClellan	Sparkman
Hayden	Millikin	Watkins
Kem	Murray	Wiley

So the amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I had purposed to offer an amendment, which I understand from the Parliamentarian is not in order at this time because of the adoption of the Ferguson amendment. My amendment had reference to the operation of the wage-and-hour law. In my State there are wholesale petroleum marketers who operate in each county. They sell gasoline and oil to farmers and retail service stations, and they are purely local, independent businessmen. However, the wage-and-hour-law examiners who go snooping about, approach one of these local agents, for instance, and say, "You come under interstate commerce." The agent says, "How do I come under interstate commerce? My operations are purely local, among my own customers." The examiner says, "You sell to farmers, and what the farmer produces may go into interstate commerce. Therefore you are in interstate commerce, and, therefore you must abide by the wage-and-hour law."

THREATENED WITH PROSECUTION

These marketers are threatened with prosecution, and some of their employees are likewise threatened with prosecution. They are told they will be fined heavily if they do not comply with the wage-and-hour law. In many instances the salaries paid the employees amount to more than is required by the wage-and-hour law.

Wholesale petroleum marketers are local businessmen, small fellows, who are carrying on their operations. I do not believe, Mr. President, the act was ever intended to apply to them. They are independent businessmen, who make 95 percent of their sales directly to retail service stations and to farmers. The rest of their sales, amounting to only 5 percent of the total, are made to customers such as road contractors, oil drilling rigs, and small industrial plants. Yet the wage-and-hour snoopers undertake to bring them all within the jurisdiction of the wage-and-hour law.

SALES LIMITED TO ONE COUNTY

In almost every case, the business of these marketers is limited to a radius of 30 miles and to one county. Only by the wildest stretch of the imagination can they be considered to be in interstate commerce. If they are engaged in interstate commerce, then every person in the United States is engaged in interstate commerce. I do not think the Senate is ready to accept such a concept.

Investigators of the Wage and Hour Division have recently begun a campaign of harassment against wholesale petroleum marketers. These marketers are reasonable men and therefore assumed that a one-county operation was not interstate commerce and that they were not covered by the law. Unfortunately, they reckoned without the legal—or rather, illegal imagination of the Wage and Hour Division. They now find themselves threatened with suits for back pay over the past two years amounting in some cases to as much as \$9,000.

EMPLOYEES THREATENED

It is significant that these suits do not come from the employees to whom the back pay is allegedly due. They come, instead, from the wage-hour investigators. The employees themselves do not want to sue. In many instances, they are getting a monthly salary in excess of the requirements of the act. The wage-hour investigators insist, however, that, in the absence of any written agreement between employer and employee, the monthly salary applies only to the basic workweek of 40 hours and does not include any payment for overtime beyond 40 hours. In at least one case, an investigator warned employees that if they attempted to waive their allegedly due back pay, they themselves would be subject to fine.

Mr. President, the investigators carry on a process of coercion and intimidation to bring about a supposed compliance with the wages-and-hours law.

The Wage and Hour Division alleges that these marketers are in interstate commerce, because:

(a) They sell petroleum to farmers, and the products which the farmers produce may go out of the State.

In other words, cotton may eventually go to Europe. If a man is a cotton producer, they allege he is in interstate commerce, and therefore the man who sells him his gasoline comes under the wages-and-hours law. That is a ridiculous proposition, Mr. President.

(b) They sell to concerns other than retail outlets, and the products of these concerns may go out of the State. But this amounts to only 5 percent of the marketers' total business.

This legal reasoning is so ridiculous that it would be curious if it were not a life-and-death matter to the businessmen involved. They operate on thin profit margins and cannot afford to pay thousands of dollars in back wages which they do not owe.

LAW SHOULD BE FAIRLY ENFORCED

I have no desire to interfere with the enforcement of the wage-hour law. It

ought to be enforced vigorously—but only against those persons to whom it applies. If the Wage and Hour Division has nothing better to do with its investigators than to harass businessmen and their employees who are not covered by the law, then I think it has too many investigators.

Mr. President, farmers are specifically exempted from the wages-and-hours law, but these investigators on the pretext that the farmers may be doing an interstate business by sending some of their products out of the State, want to bring into the system the very people who furnish the farmers with the supplies for operations.

In his testimony before the Appropriations Committees, the Wage and Hour Administrator made much of the fact that 57 percent of all business establishments investigated were found to be in violation of the law. If this figure of 57 percent includes alleged violations by persons who are not covered by the law at all, it is obviously too high. If the Administrator did not investigate anybody except exempt businesses, he might be able to produce a figure of 97 percent violations—or even 100 percent.

BACKLOG OF COMPLAINTS

The Wage and Hour Division has a heavy backlog of complaints of violations of the law. On January 1 of this year, that backlog amounted to 3,773 cases—more than three times its size of a year earlier. The Division ought to devote itself to getting rid of this backlog instead of snooping around people who are not covered by the law and who are not complaining. But it is allotting only 25 percent of its investigative program to complaints.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum dealing with the subject I have been discussing.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHOLESALE MARKETER

(a) There are approximately 50,000 men in this business throughout the Nation, operating in every State. There are roughly 3,000 men in the business in Texas.

(b) The marketer represents the wholesale distribution link between any producer of petroleum on the one hand, and the consumer (viz., service stations, farms, etc.) on the other. Generally there is one marketer for each producer (Texas Co., Gulf, Phillips, Magnolia, etc.) in each county.

(c) The marketer is an independent businessman, this being established by definition in H. R. 6000 (extension of Social Security) last year. His arrangement with a producer ranges from that of consignee, who owns part of the equipment he uses (trucks, tanks, etc.) and operates on a flat commission on all oil and grease sold, to that of jobber on the other hand, who operates completely independently, buying the product at the most favorable price and selling it the same way, and who owns all equipment and stock in his business.

(d) Dollar volume: The average wholesale marketer averages 60,000 gallons of petroleum per month in sales. (He may range from 20,000 to over 300,000 gallons.) His margin averages between 1 and 2 cents per gallon.

He employs 1.3 men only (thus hardly constituting a field of employment, within the intent of this law, but more nearly being a one-man operation). He owns two trucks.

(e) Geographical aspects: He is, by necessity of distribution requirements, located in almost every county. His radius of operation rarely exceeds 30 miles and almost always is limited to his own immediate county.

(f) His customers: Examination of the dollar volume of his business divides his customers as follows:

	Percent
(a) Retail (service stations)-----	65
(b) Farms-----	30
(c) Others (road contractors, oil drilling rigs, small industrial plants)-----	5

EFFECTS OF THE PRESENT LAW

The attached exhibit, a copy of a letter tells the story of the effects of the interpretation of this law on one individual marketer. In the last 3 weeks in central Texas alone, three additional cases have arisen and the pattern is usually the same.

1. The marketer at present is totally unaware that he is allegedly operating in interstate commerce.

2. An investigator from the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor visits his office, inspects his books, states that he is in interstate commerce for one or more of the following reasons: (No cases have yet been reported where the inspector "found" otherwise.)

(a) He does business with farms and their products may go out of State. (Manifest unfairness of this reasoning lies in the fact that the farmers themselves are specifically exempt from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.)

(b) He does business with concerns other than retail outlets (regardless of the fact that it is only a fractional amount) and their products may go out of State.

(c) He is therefore subject to the provisions of wages and hours, must put his employees on a 40-hour week at 75 cents per hour minimum, pay time and a half overtime.

(d) He must pay his employees allegedly due back overtime pay for a period of 2 years or face suit for double the amount involved (one-half being a fine). This amount in Texas has ranged from \$1,800 to approximately \$9,000.

(e) Employees are encouraged to press such suits. In at least one case, the investigator warned the employees that if they attempted to waive their allegedly due back pay, they themselves would be subject to fine.

(f) The small operator, faced with this amount in nearly every case is faced with the prospect of going out of business. This in turn would destroy the very jobs the law was designed to aid.

(g) In many instances, the employer is paying a monthly salary equivalent to more than the 75-cent minimum. However, investigators insist, in the absence of any written agreement between employer and employee, that the base figure involves only the base 40 hours and thus "overtime pay at a much higher hourly rate is still due."

SHOULD BE EXEMPT FROM LAW

1. Wholesale marketers do not, as a group, constitute a real employment field, as Congress intended the law to affect. They are largely one man operations, average 1.3 employees per employer.

2. They are allegedly subject to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act because they do business (about 30 percent) with farmers. Yet the farmers themselves are exempt as a class from the provisions of this same law.

3. They are also allegedly subject to the provisions of the law because they sell oil and grease to small industrial firms whose products may go out of the State. This

percentage is so fractional, however, average of 5 percent, as to be manifestly unfair. Their entire purpose is to serve service stations (exempt) and farms (exempt).

4. They cannot (in rural areas particularly) stay in business under these arbitrary rulings. Their margin of profit is too thin, other costs too high, volume too small to face sudden claims for alleged back wages. This will result in their going out of business and the loss of employment to their employees.

5. If this group can be considered, by arbitrary interpretation, to be in interstate commerce, then every single businessman can, by the same token, be so considered. This implies Federal control over all business, occupations, professions. That was not the intent of Congress.

A TYPICAL CASE OF BROWBEATING

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a copy of a letter which sets forth one typical case of browbeating and intimidation on the claim that the persons involved come within the law.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MAY 7, 1951.

DEAR —: With reference to our telephone conversation this afternoon concerning the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor, with — of —, Texas, I will give you the following history:

Mr. — is a small gasoline wholesale agent selling — oil products at an average of about 1½ cents per gallon, commission. He bought this agency here in 1945, after he was discharged from the armed service of World War II.

He has employed, three truck drivers and one bookkeeper.

About 3 weeks ago, Mr. — came to his office in — and informed him he was with the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor and thought that possibly he came under the Fair Labor Standards Act. At Mr. —'s suggestion, Mr. — let him examine his books and records. He then took out a pamphlet and stated that according to the law, — would come under the act, because he sold grease and oil to oil producers and that the oil they produced might eventually go out of the State.

He then informed Mr. — that he would have to put all of his men on a 40-hour-week basis and pay time and a half for overtime. He also told Mr. — that he would have to pay all of his men the back overtime for a period of 2 years prior to that time. He then checked over —'s books again and said that the back wages which he would have to pay the employees amounted to about \$4,000.

— is a small operator, and, of course, this \$4,000 would put him out of business.

— then talked with his four employees about the matter and told them the situation. They told him that they did not want to sue him for any back wages, that they were satisfied with what he had been paying them, and that they wanted to continue working for him. — immediately put all of his employees on the 40-hour-week basis, time and a half for overtime, and is paying them according to such orders. The employees told Mr. — that they would sign any paper or release that was necessary, except that Mr. — told them that they would be subject to a \$250 fine if they signed any release or compromise of their claim for back wages. However, they assured Mr. — that they did not want any back wages, and they are still on the job and everybody is satisfied except the — office of this Bureau.

On May 4, 1951, the — office wrote Mr. —, and I am enclosing herewith the original of their letter.

I have heard of lots of Government interference in private business, and we are all sick of it, but I don't believe that I ever heard of the Government trying to dictate to the employees that they cannot settle their claim for back wages with an employer, even though the employees and the employer are agreed upon it. Possibly individuals, under such a set-up have no right to contract between themselves, without the permission of some bureaucrat.

Mr. — does not know what to do with reference to the circumstance in the letter of May 4 that the Bureau at — will hold the file open until May 18, 1951, before taking any action against Mr. —.

I would appreciate your taking some immediate steps in connection with this matter, as I do not believe Congress or anyone else approves of such tactics.

Yours very truly,

GROWING BUREAUCRACY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the regional office of the Wage and Hour Division in Dallas, which covers Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, is the second largest in the country, exceeded in size only by that in New York, which covers only New York and New Jersey.

There are 180 employees in the Dallas office, of whom 107 are investigators and 11 are investigation supervisors.

Mr. President, this is growing to be a bureaucracy of the worst character. I am glad the Ferguson amendment reducing appropriations for personnel has been agreed to.

OPS AND BEEF—LETTER FROM GRANT E. ANDERSON TO SENATOR THYE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me? Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to read a letter I received from a partner in a business establishment. Two young men established the business after they were discharged from the military forces following the end of the war in 1945. What is set forth in the letter is rather typical of conditions with which some businessmen are now faced, and more especially the young man who is operating on limited capital. The letter comes from the A. & P. Chip Steak Co., North Mankato, Minn. It is dated June 4, 1951, and is as follows:

DEAR ED: Ten years ago when we were driving along some of these long Minnesota roads I never dreamed that I would be writing you as one of your constituents. But with the present beef situation under OPS I thought I would let you know what it is doing to us.

If you remember my partner and myself were down to your farm and talked to you about going into slaughtering our own cattle fearing price control and the result of Government control.

To give you an idea what is happening to us and I imagine other small businesses I will quote figures off invoices from Armour & Co.

The week of January 22, 1951, we purchased from Armour & Co. 52 beef rounds (3,723 pounds) at a price of 44 cents per pound.

The week of May 28, 1951, we were able to purchase from Armour only one (77 pounds) round at a price of 50.55 per pound.

In addition to this we were able to purchase from Swift & Co. two high-priced cuts

of beef, one of 25 pounds at 75.60 per pound and 102½ pounds at 70 cents per pound.

We have three other packers calling on us and we were not able to get any beef at all from them.

I could cite you many, many more inequities such as—the ceiling of hamburger patties imposed on us is 60.40 per pound which is the same ceiling as the major packers have as their price.

From the above it seems to me clear that either OPS goes or else we will go.

Ed, I know how busy you are but I wanted to get my two bits worth into Washington where I thought it would do the most good. I would appreciate any information that you could give us on the situation.

Sincerely,

GRANT E. ANDERSON.

This is a veteran who served for many years throughout World War II. He is one of the young men who went into business.

He adds this postscript:

P. S.—Other troubles: My partner, Gibb, is being called back into the Army July 6. We were flooded out for 2 weeks during the flood in North Mankato.

That was the terrific flood of last spring.

How about a job after OPS gets through with us?

This is a letter from Grant E. Anderson, a young man whom I have known for many years. This letter deals with OPS regulations. I stated last spring that we were off to a bad start. I think we are in a bad situation at the present time.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Indiana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, line 12, after the word "approval," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no State which has, by legislative enactment, provided the conditions under which public access may be had to the records of the disbursements of grants in aid funds shall be denied its allocation of Federal funds under titles I, IV, X, and XIV if such State has otherwise complied with the governing statutory provisions."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment and take it to conference. I believe that it is necessary.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-8-51—B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 9, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$31,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an amendment to decrease the appropriation suggested by the Senate committee for the maintenance and operation of local schools in federally affected areas.

I was very glad to work and vote for the original bill providing for school construction in federally affected areas, and for the maintenance and operation of such schools. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] performed a very valuable service in getting this legislation to the floor and through the Congress, and I am very much in favor of it. I do think, however, that there are certain facts which we should bear in mind as we vote on the appropriation.

The Office of Education informs us that a total of \$41,500,000 would pay for all the added Federal costs in every district in the country. In other words with this amount we could provide 100 percent of the requested Federal support for the maintenance of local schools to the degree to which those costs had been increased. I think we should remember that, in the first place, there is a tendency to overestimate the added Federal costs. When we are dealing with Uncle Sam it is always easy to be generous by way of padding costs or overestimating costs, particularly when we look forward to the future. So I am personally inclined to sprinkle a little salt on the estimate of \$41,500,000.

There is another offsetting factor which should be borne in mind. It is true that Federal installations bring large numbers of children from outside the school district into the district, thus creating an added strain upon the school resources. But it is also true that in the wake of those children and in the wake of those families will come added stores, and in some cases added housing. Therefore the taxable capacity of the locality is increased along with the burden. The taxable capacity is not increased in the same ratio as the added burden, but it is increased to some extent.

The House of Representatives made an appropriation of only \$28,000,000 for this purpose, which would provide for 68 percent of the estimated total cost, which, as I have said, I think is a padded figure.

The Senate committee raised this amount to \$40,000,000 at the request of the Bureau of the Budget. The appropriation suggested by the committee would meet over 97 percent of all the estimated cost, virtually the entire estimated cost. In view of the fact that I think these budget estimates are excessive, in view of the fact that there is added taxable capacity, and in view of the principle that the localities should assume some share of the burden, I believe it is safe to cut this figure to \$31,000,000. That is \$3,000,000 more than the House figure, and it would provide 75 percent even of the high total cost figures given out by the Office of Education.

I am in favor of the proposal which the eminent Senator from Minnesota

[Mr. HUMPHREY] advanced, that the Federal Government should meet at least a portion of these costs which are federally created. I am in favor of welfare programs and social reform during periods of prosperity, within the limits of a balanced budget. But I do not believe that in periods of prosperity we should spend grossly excessive amounts above the amounts which we collect in taxes. If we do that, we are allowing our hearts to run away with our heads. We are creating a deficit which can be met only by borrowing; and in periods of prosperity, when workers are employed, such borrowing is generally in the form of bank credit, resulting in bidding up prices, and in inflation. So we do more damage through the indirect effects of the governmental deficit than we realize in benefits from the direct effects of the appropriation.

I wish to make my position very clear. I am for appropriations for welfare; but in a period of full employment I want to have the Government balance its budget, because if the budget is not balanced, inflation is bound to ensue. I submit that this is a sane program of social reform within the confines of a balanced budget.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say to the good Senator from Illinois that when he refers to this particular item as a matter of social welfare, he is in error. This is not social welfare at all. It is for the payment of costs of operating the school systems throughout the Nation.

Let me explain why the committee made this recommendation, so that the Senate may be informed as to what it is voting upon. I have stated heretofore, and I repeat, that the Senate is supreme in these matters. If the Senate desires to cut the figure, well and good. However I do not believe the Senate would be justified in cutting one penny from the committee's recommendations unless it had information upon which to justify such a cut.

For what purpose is the \$40,000,000 to be used? It is to be used for payments to school districts, not for social welfare. The committee recommended \$40,000,000, an increase of \$12,000,000 over the House allowance, for which the Senate received a supplemental estimate, known as Senate Document No. 40, on May 21, together with a change of language to correct an inaccuracy in the estimate and to permit the use of funds in carrying out the provisions of section 6 of Public Law 874.

We should have in mind that last fall when the estimates were submitted to the Bureau of the Budget they were based on what were supposed to be the requirements at that time. The Bureau of the Budget had approved the \$28,000,000. After the approval by the Bureau of the Budget, the Congress of the United States passed Public Law 874, in which the Government was authorized, wherever the Federal Government, because of its national defense activities, caused an impact upon local school districts, to contribute to the work of the public-school system.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, a formula was worked out, and the schools which did not meet the requirements of the formula were not considered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was last fall.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. During the current year, as I understand from the report, only 68 per cent of the schools which met the formula requirements received payments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. In that connection I should like to point out that two school districts in my State have not paid their teachers this year because of the existence of that very situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The same situation exists in every State of the Union. For example, there is tremendous activity in South Carolina, in the area which is being developed by the Atomic Energy Commission. Perhaps 20,000 or 30,000 families with children will be brought into the area. In the first place, the Government has taken the land from the people of South Carolina and has thus taken it from the State's tax rolls. Thousands of children will be brought into the area. Such situations are behind the philosophy of Public Law 874, which Congress passed after the original requirements were submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. Since that time the House allowed \$28,000,000. All the Senate committee has done is to take into consideration Public Law 874. On the basis of such consideration it approved \$12,000,000 more. It is that simple.

Mr. President, we should either appropriate the money, or Public Law 874 should not be on the statute books. The Federal Government should contribute what Congress determines to be its just share by reason of the impact of Federal activities in individual States.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Long
Anderson	Green	Magnuson
Bennett	Hayden	Maybank
Bricker	Hendrickson	McCarran
Bridges	Hennings	McCarthy
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	McFarland
Capehart	Hoey	McKellar
Carlson	Holland	McMahon
Chavez	Humphrey	Monroney
Clements	Hunt	Moody
Connally	Ives	Morse
Cordon	Jenner	Mundt
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Eaton	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Kerr	Pastore
Ferguson	Kilgore	Robertson
Frear	Knowland	Russell
George	Lehman	Saltonstall

Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.
Smith, N. C.
Sparkman
Stennis

Taft
Thye
Tobey
Underwood
Watkins

Welker
Wherry
Wiley
Williams
Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from New Mexico. As I understand the amendment which we are now considering, it proposes to reduce certain funds intended for educational institutions in congested and critical areas. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say, if the Senator will permit me, that I am as much in favor of economy as is any other Member of the Senate. I worked long and hard on the appropriations in an endeavor to effect economies, but the amendments, including the one which is now before the Senate, which affect schools, will do nothing short of inflicting serious injury upon my own State and upon many other States. We have on the Savannah River an atomic energy plant which is taking 250,000 acres of land which will be removed from the tax rolls of South Carolina. It is expected that 35,000 people will be employed at that plant. My State cannot possibly afford to provide the necessary schools and other facilities which will be needed in connection with that development.

I favor economy, but I want the RECORD to show that the kind of economy proposed in this instance, which affects an area comprising 250,000 acres of land and which also affects the farmers, is not an economy from the viewpoint of the people of my State. No one in the State of South Carolina asked that the atomic energy plant be located on the Savannah River, and most of us were very much shocked when we learned that it was to be located there. It takes 250,000 acres of land, including some of the best land in the State. It is estimated that, for its peak operations, the plant will require an influx of 35,000 people, who will be employed there, and who will bring their families with them.

I should simply like to know what the people of my State would expect me to do other than to support to the end an appropriation of the necessary funds with which to develop the schools and other facilities of that district, even though they feel, as I do, that economy is the first order of business. I certainly do not want inflation, but when it comes to making cuts of this kind in connection with the project in the Savannah River Valley, I oppose it.

The Senators from Georgia know the situation in the area to which I have referred as well as I do. Other Senators know it also. The same thing is going to happen in the home State of our distinguished Vice President, in the Paducah area. Certain increases were made in the bill in order to take care of the atomic energy installations, were there not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted the RECORD to show that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let us make clear the reason for the action of the Committee on Appropriations in recommending an increase of \$12,000,000 in this item. The Bureau of Education, under the law, is required to present evidence before the Budget Bureau. It is generally done in the fall of the year. The Bureau of Education for this purpose requested of the Budget Bureau \$28,000,000, which request was approved by the Bureau. After the request had been made and approved, the Congress of the United States passed Public Law 874 for the purpose of caring for the situation which has been outlined by the Senator from South Carolina and similar situations.

When the House of Representatives acted on the appropriation bill the only information it had, so far as the budget was concerned, was that the sum of \$28,000,000 had been approved last fall. It acted upon that information and under those circumstances, and allowed \$28,000,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in a moment. On the 21st of May the Budget Bureau sent to the Committee on Appropriations a supplemental estimate of \$12,000,000 designed to take care of the additional obligations of the Government under Public Law 874; which was acted upon by the House committee. Therefore, all we are doing now is to approve the budget figures.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not true that the additional money was for the purpose of atomic-energy installations at Paducah, Ky., on the Savannah River in South Carolina, and at other places?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct; and also in connection with an installation in North Carolina. It could be used anywhere in the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that; but will the Senator not agree with me that, if we materially reduce this appropriation, restoring it, let us say, to the House figure, then these installations will not be properly cared for? Will the Senator say that I am wrong about that?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the Senator from South Carolina is not at all wrong. I stated, in his absence, that I felt sure many thousands of acres of taxable land had been or would be taken.

Mr. MAYBANK. The project contemplates the taking of 250,000 acres of land on the Savannah River in South Carolina.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I really did not know the full extent of the area taken, but I said it amounted to thousands of acres. The philosophy behind the enactment of Public Law 874 was that it would in a way compensate for the loss of revenues with which to carry on governmental functions within the respective States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. In spite of the fact that we now, in fiscal 1951, have an increased load to carry for these federally affected areas, is it not true that it was found possible to fill but 68 percent of the entitlement under the formula which is the basis of our present operations?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not also correct that, with this increased load, unless additional money is made available, we shall be unable to fill as much as 50 percent of the entitlement under that formula?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. In addition to the matters which have already been mentioned in the areas affected, is the Senator familiar with Keesler Field, located in the heart of the city of Biloxi, Miss., where more than 40 percent of the municipality is federally owned at this time?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not only familiar with Keesler Field, in the Senator's home State, but I am familiar, in a way, with many fields in the State of the Senator from Oklahoma. In my home State there are two of the largest atomic energy activities in the country. What is proposed is only to carry out the authorization which was provided last fall by congressional action, that where local districts are suffering from the impact of Government activities, the Government should participate in a contribution.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have reference to Public Law 874, based on House bill 7940, which was approved on September 30, 1950, by which time the request had already been made. That is why on the 21st of May a new estimate was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

We are either going to comply with the law or we are not. It is all right to say "cut," but why should the State of Georgia, the State of South Carolina, the State of New Mexico, or any other State in the Union, merely because the Federal Government, of necessity, creates a Federal activity, be burdened with the education of many thousands of children?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not true that the greater the military activity, the greater the demands on the local communities?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There can be no question about that. In the first place, the Government takes away taxable land. The Government takes over acreage in my State. It has been taken over to the extent of millions of acres. Sixty-three percent of the area of my State now belongs to the Federal Government, and, of course, the State cannot collect taxes on it. In the State of Nevada the condition is even worse than that.

Mr. McCARRAN. In Nevada the Government owns 87 percent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Thirteen percent of the area of the State of Nevada is carrying the costs of the State government. It was to meet that condition that Public Law 874 was passed. The figure in the bill is not an increase by the Senate committee, but an approval of the budget figure.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that if we do not approve this figure, the school terms will have to be cut?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The average State school district cannot stand it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not a fact that if the increased amount is not provided, communities which have come into existence since the budget was made up will not be treated as are other places in the United States where installations were made prior to that time?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In other words, this bill equalizes the conditions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are equalized by an appropriation based on an authorization by the Congress to carry out the purposes of the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, with reference to this amendment, last year there was provided by the Federal Government an appropriation, with transfers, totaling \$28,285,000. That amount provided for 68 percent of the cost for educational purposes accruing because of the expansion of Federal installations. In other words, the Federal Government bore 68 percent of the cost. This year the regular and supplemental estimate for this purpose totaled \$40,000,000. That amount is included in this bill, which means that it is recommended on the basis of the estimates, and it enables the Federal Government to pay 97 percent of the total cost. The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois calls for an appropriation of \$31,000,000. With such a sum the Federal Government would provide 75 percent of the cost. But, even with the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, the Federal Government would be participating to the extent of 7 percent more than it was last year, and on a higher level than obtained last year.

I realize the problem this construction presents in many parts of the country. Unfortunately, in my own section of New England we have not been favored by the administration placing any great installations there. We would like to have some, but we have been skipped in the distribution. We would welcome such installations in our sections.

I believe, Mr. President, since last year the Federal Government provided a total of \$28,285,000, or 68 percent of the funds, that if we provide \$31,000,000

this year, or 75 percent of the total, and 7 percent more than last year, we are doing the fair thing. Therefore I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be agreed to, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who is absent on official business is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent, and if present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—25

Alben	Bridges	Douglas
Bennett	Butler, Md.	Dworshak
Bricker	Capehart	Ferguson

Frear
Gillette
Hendrickson
Hickenlooper
Ives
Jenner

Mundt
Nixon
O'Connor
Saltontall
Smith, Maine
Smith, N. J.

Taft
Welker
Wherry
Williams

NAYS—53

Anderson
Butler, Nebr.
Carlson
Chavez
Clements
Connally
Cordon
Eastland
Eaton
Ellender
George
Green
Hayden
Hennings
Hill
Hoey
Holand
Humphrey

Hunt
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Tex.
Johnston, S. C.
Kefauver
Kerr
Kilgore
Knowland
Lehman
Long
Magnuson
Maybank
McCarran
McCarthy
McClellan
McFarland
McKellar
McMahon

Monroney
Moody
Morse
Neely
O'Mahoney
Pastore
Robertson
Russell
Smith, N. C.
Sparkman
Stennis
Thye
Tobey
Underwood
Watkins
Wiley
Young

NOT VOTING—18

Benton
Brewster
Byrd
Cain
Case
Dirksen

Duff
Flanders
Fulbright
Kem
Langer
Lodge

Malone
Martin
Millikin
Murray
Schoeppel
Smathers

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "6-7-51-U," which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Pro-

vided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the payment of remuneration for annual or sick leave of classified or Wage Board employees in excess of 20 days of annual leave per year or 12 days of sick leave per year."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think the facts of annual and sick leave are getting to be fairly well known. Classified and wage board employees now receive 26 working days of annual leave each year, and 15 days of sick leave each year. This 26 days of annual leave, I emphasize, is not on the basis of calendar days, but on the basis of working days.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that the chairman of the subcommittee will be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico, but I should like to finish the argument, if I may.

Since the Government is on a 5-day week, this amounts to 5½ weeks of annual leave a year; and the 15 days of sick leave, on the basis of a 5-day week, amount to 3 weeks a year. As a matter of fact, workers in the Foreign Service receive 60 days of annual leave a year, and that applies to home duty as well as to foreign duty.

Mr. President, the number of industrial concerns in the country which

make such liberal provision for annual and sick leave as does the Government are very few indeed.

I have before me a study by the National Industrial Conference Board, just issued, on vacation practices. That shows that in all the industries surveyed the maximum vacation leave given to any employee is 2 weeks for 47.8 percent of the employees and 3 weeks for 42.9 percent. So the greatest vacation period any employee can get, with respect to over 90 percent of the employees working in all the industries surveyed, is 3 weeks or less. Only 7 percent can have as much as a maximum of 4 weeks. Only a little over 1 percent can have above 4 weeks. The rest get only 1 week. I wish to emphasize that the figures I am now quoting represent the maximum.

Private plans tend to be graduated. The Federal plan is uniform, for all employees, on the first day of entrance into the system as well as at the conclusion of 40 years of service. So what is now being done is to provide 5½ weeks vacation for every employee in the Government service, irrespective of how long he has been employed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a table showing the results of the survey of the National Industrial Conference Board.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Maximum paid vacation allowances in 303 companies—by industry

Industry	Hourly employees (number of companies)						Salaried employees (number of companies)					
	Total	1 week	2 weeks	3 weeks	4 weeks	Over 4 weeks	Total	1 week	2 weeks	3 weeks	4 weeks	Over 4 weeks
Total, manufacturing and nonmanufacturing:												
All industries.....	273	9	128	122	12	2	301	3	144	129	21	4
Percent of total.....	100.0	3.3	46.9	44.7	4.4	0.7	100.0	1.0	47.8	42.9	7.0	1.3
A. Manufacturing:												
Total.....	233	9	120	96	8	0	235	3	134	86	11	1
Percent of total.....	100.0	3.9	51.5	41.2	3.4	0	100.0	1.3	57.0	36.6	4.7	.4
Aircraft.....	3		2	1			3		2			1 (a)
Automotive and farm equipment.....	12		10	2			12		9	2	1	
Building materials.....	12	1	10	1			11		9	2		
Chemicals.....	11		3	5	3		11		4	4		
Electrical equipment.....	19		7	10	2		19		9	8	3	
Foods and beverages.....	10		8	11			10		9	8	2	
Glass.....	3		3				20		8	11	1	
Leather.....	4	1	2	1			3		3			
Machinery (except electrical).....	36	1	20	15			4		3	1		
Metals and metal products.....	37	1	20	15	1		36		23	13		
Professional scientific instruments.....	7		3	4			37		22	14	1	
Paper.....	17		3	14			7		2	5		
Petroleum.....	5		2				17		6	11		
Printing and publishing.....	8		4	1	2		6		3	1	2	
Rubber.....	6		1	5			8		4	3	1	
Shipbuilding and railroad equipment.....	3		2	1			6		1	5		
Textiles.....	22	4	14	4			3		2	1		
Miscellaneous.....	9	1	6	2			22	2	16	4		
							10	1	8	1		
B. Nonmanufacturing:												
Total.....	40	0	8	26	4	2	66	0	10	43	10	3
Percent of total.....	100.0	0	20.0	65.0	10.0	5.0	100.0	0	15.2	65.1	15.2	4.5
Wholesale and retail trade.....	4		1	1	2		6		1	2	3	
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	5		1	2	1	1	23		1	14	6	2
Transportation.....	10		2	8			11		3	8		
Communication.....	3			2	1		4			3	1	
Public utilities.....	16		2	13		1	18		2	15		1
Services.....	2		2				4		3	1		

¹ 24 days.

² In 1 company 2 weeks' vacation but 3 weeks' pay.

³ 22 days.

⁴ In 1 company, 1 month; in 1 company, 22 days.

⁵ 6 weeks.

Source: National Industrial Conference Board, Paid Vacation Practices (1951) p. 6.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator

from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that in practice most Federal employees never do take all their leave; they simply accumulate it, so that if their services are

terminated they draw terminal leave pay for as much as 60 days. Formerly they were able to draw terminal leave pay for 90 days. Many of them seem to prefer to accumulate annual leave, so that they can draw additional money if and when their Government employment is terminated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator went into this question in some detail.

The present leave or vacation practice has developed by accident. The other day I pointed out that in 1898 Congress enacted a law giving civil employees 30 days annual leave. I think there is no doubt that what Congress intended was to give to civil employees the same amount of leave which men in the military service received. Men in the military service received then, and now receive, 30 calendar days of leave each year. But in the year 1900, in the administration of William McKinley, someone in the executive office interpreted the 1898 law as meaning 30 working days. So under the act of 1898 annual leave became not a vacation of a month, but a vacation of 5 weeks since the Government was on a 6-day week. Then matters went on until 1933. In the economy bill in the spring of 1933, annual leave was cut back to 15 days, which on the basis of a 6-day week, amounted to 2½ weeks' leave.

In 1936 conditions were a bit better. The anxiety to balance the budget may have been somewhat less. In any event, Congress extended annual leave to 26 days. I think there is no doubt as to what the purpose of Congress was in 1936. The Government was on a 6-day week. The provision of 26 days annual leave a year was an attempt to provide a month's vacation and no more, because on the average there are 26 working days in a month, assuming that the employee works Saturdays. No doubt the purpose was to provide a month's vacation.

However, in 1945, after VJ-day, the Government went on a 5-day week. But the leave provisions were not changed, so the 26 days annual leave became 5½ weeks, and the 15 days sick leave became 3 weeks instead of 2½.

Mr. President, I desire to see justice done to Government employees. I believe that in the lower grades we are doing very well for Government employees, although we are not paying those in the upper grades the full market value. However, we give them security. Let me say that, in view of the recent increase in the cost of living I shall be very glad to support the bill which I understand the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is about to report, providing for a salary increase of about 8 percent to offset the increase in the cost of living. I am perfectly willing to do that, and glad to do it. I think we should do it. But I see no reason to give these extraordinary privileges to Government employees.

While I am speaking on this subject, I should like to point out that the postal workers fare very badly indeed in comparison with other workers. They are given 15 days of annual leave a year, and

10 days sick leave. This means that instead of getting 5½ weeks annual leave, they get 3 weeks. Instead of getting 3 weeks sick leave, they get two weeks.

Some of the postal employees have said that what we should do is to raise the postal leave to 26 days, and sick leave to 15 days. In my judgment, we should come down to some uniform basis which can apply to all classes, and not discriminate against the postal service. If my present amendment is adopted, I promise that when the Post Office appropriation bill comes before the Senate I will offer an amendment to raise the level of annual and sick leave for Post Office employees to 20 and 12 days, respectively, as provided in the pending amendment for other Government employees.

Let us consider how many days during the year Government employees really work. We can approach this question by considering how many days there are in which they do not work. With 52 weeks during the year, which is, I think, a correct assumption, and 6 days a week, there is a maximum of 313 days, with 52 days taken out for Sundays. But, of course, Saturdays are also holidays. That brings the total down to 261. Then there are 26 leave days plus 15 days' sick leave, or a total of 41 days, plus 8 holidays, making a total of 49. Then when visitors of note come to this country there is a day off for governmental employees, in Washington at least, so that the crowds along Constitution Avenue may be swelled.

When, every 4 years, a President is inaugurated from 1 to 2 days are taken off. When it is excessively hot in the summertime, Government departments are closed. I think it is safe to say that the average Government employee does not work more than from 209 to 212 days.

Even on the basis of an 8-hour day, that comes to a little less than 1,700 hours a year. It seems to me not excessive to ask Government employees to perform somewhere between 1,900 and 2,000 hours of work every year. But all my amendment would require is that they work an extra 48 hours and take 18 hours less sick leave.

I believe that this is a chance really to save money and to put the Government service on a self-respecting basis. I have made some computations as to the savings which would be effected by my amendment.

If it were applied to all branches of the Government, it would save not far from \$250,000,000. In justice we should say that from this should be deducted the increased amounts which would go to postal workers if we were to increase their leave to a level of 20 and 12 days respectively. That would represent an increased cost of about \$50,000,000, which we should offset against the economy of \$250,000,000.

As I see it, no real argument can be made against the amendment except the political power of 2,500,000 Government employees. In November 1949, I first proposed a cut in annual leave in speeches off the floor of the Senate. I first offered such a provision as a rider to a deficiency appropriation bill on the

9th of March 1950. It was rejected by a vote of 57 to 14. In April of 1950 I introduced two bills, one providing for 20 days annual and 12 days sick leave, and the other for leave on a sliding scale, depending upon length of service of 10, 15, or 20 days, respectively.

I tried to modify the general appropriation bill on July 20, 1950 by a similar proposal. My proposal was rejected by a voice vote. The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service considered my two bills. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who was the chairman of the subcommittee, did an extremely good job.

I wish to call attention to what the Government departments did or did not do in this connection. On the 8th of May 1950 the Civil Service Commission recommended that no change be made until a thorough study could be made. On July 17 the Comptroller General made a similar recommendation. On August 7, 1950, the Bureau of the Budget made a similar recommendation. The Postmaster General never went into the question of a thorough study; he merely made an adverse report from the very beginning.

Not getting much cooperation from governmental agencies, in September 1950 the staff of the subcommittee began a study, asking for the cooperation of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget. I have seen a copy of the committee's staff report, and I think it is an excellent one. It recommends reductions in annual leave although a sliding scale is proposed. I wish to compliment the staff of the committee and the members of the committee for the excellent study which they have produced. I hope that at some time during the course of the debate it may be made a part of the RECORD.

But the record is clear that the governmental administrative agencies are trying to sabotage any cut in leave. They are refusing to commit themselves. They hope we will wear ourselves out and that the issue will be forgotten. The Bureau of the Budget, which should defend the interests of the taxpayers of the country, by silence tends to line up with its fellow employees in the executive departments.

These are harsh words, but I think they are true words. The point is that every time an attempt is made to curtail the privileges of persons in governmental employ the ranks close around them. Various bureaus rally to their defense. I have no intention of attacking governmental employees. I believe that on the whole they are a fine group. On the whole they are hard working and excellent, law-abiding people. However, through accident they have been allowed to obtain privileges, and being human, they want to hold on to them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question is whether or not the amendment, if it is adopted as a part of the pending appropriation bill, will become permanent legislation, or whether it will apply only,

to the appropriations involved in the pending bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The proposal I am making would apply only to the pending appropriation bill. However, it is my intention to offer similar amendments to every appropriation bill. I am waiting for the time when the State Department appropriation bill comes to the Senate. Members of the Foreign Service on duty in the United States get not 5 weeks but 12 weeks vacation each year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senator from Illinois offers a similar amendment to each appropriation bill it will, of course, apply to that bill, and only to that bill. Furthermore, if such amendments are agreed to, the provisions will only apply to the new fiscal year. Such provisions will not be in effect, of course, in succeeding years, unless similar provisions are inserted in each appropriation bill each year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I have grown tired of waiting for permanent legislation to come from the committee. I have been waiting for the Government to take a stand on this issue. I would like to begin here and now, and not be paid off with promises upon some conjectural future.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator realize that in the Independent Offices Appropriation bill there is contained a provision, inserted by the committee, which in effect would compel the Administrator to give every employee an opportunity to take the full 26 days leave? Therefore, in this period of emergency, Congress would in effect compel every employee to take 26 days leave, no matter what the demands might be as a result of the defense effort.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that it may or may not be a good thing. I am not addressing my amendment to the question of whether a Government employee must take his leave in a given year. I am addressing my amendment to the point that I believe the present total amount of leave is excessive, whether it be taken or stored up for the future, and that we should reduce it.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we permit it to be stored for future use and allow it to be paid off in terminal leave, we will get the same result, will we not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I would cut the leave from 26 days to 20 days. It would be a saving of 6 days in annual leave. In certain cases of sick leave it would be 3 days. It would be a total saving of approximately \$250,000,000 on all appropriation bills. On the pending bill it would effect a saving of more than \$5,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Illinois misunderstood my purpose. My point is that if his amendment were not approved, the employees would be able to build up and carry over what he considers to be excessive leave barring some other limitation on its accumulation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Michigan for turning out to be a friend and supporter instead of a side-swiper.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has been a supporter of all cuts in appropriations.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not correct to say that 26 days of leave, computed on a 5-day week, amounts to more than 5 weeks?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It amounts to 5½ weeks. If I remember correctly my school-day arithmetic, 26 divided by 5 is 5½.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois know of any private industry which grants its employees an annual vacation of 1 month with pay?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I learn from a recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board that in all the industries which they surveyed, only 1.3 percent of salaried employees get more than 4 weeks vacation with pay, and those are probably for executives and others with extremely long periods of service.

Mr. MOODY. We are talking about 5 weeks in the pending bill, are we not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I believe we have a unique situation. I do not believe any industry in the country is so liberal as is our Government. I admire a liberal government, but this is being excessively liberal.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether the Senator knows also that in most agencies 15 days of sick leave can be taken without the necessity of submitting a doctor's certificate, but merely upon the person's word. Therefore, to the 5 weeks of leave the Senator should add 3 weeks of sick leave.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. In justice to Government employees it should however be said that not all the employees take their maximum sick leave. The average is somewhere between 8 and 9 days.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to point out to my distinguished colleague from Illinois and to my other colleagues that we are hearing this afternoon a courageous address. We see the distinguished Senator from Illinois standing up on the floor of the Senate, facing the country as a whole, and speaking courageously on an issue which is bound to be unpopular with a large segment of our people. It is typical of the courageous approach which the Senator from Illinois has made to many national issues, and I commend him for that exercise of courage. However, I should like to point out to him perhaps as an effective way to realize his object. I suggest to him that when the Democratic Party meets in Chicago next year it make his point a plank in its national platform.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my good friend from New Hampshire for his kind

words, which, I assure him, I do not deserve. I believe the Democratic convention will meet after the Republican convention has met. If the Republicans should adopt such a plank, I am certain that the Democratic Party will also adopt a similar one.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire only to ask a question. Inasmuch as the Senator from Illinois is trying to save money by his amendment, why could not the Senate practice that kind of economy also, in view of the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee has stated he would accept the Senator's amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is an old saying, beware of the Greeks bearing gifts.

I have been in this body long enough to beware of the chairman of a committee who says in an enticing tone of voice, "Let me take the amendment to conference," because I think that is frequently the parliamentary equivalent of saying, "Let me take the child into the Tower, and I will strangle him to death."

So, Mr. President, I regret to peer rather searchingly at the eminent gentleman from New Mexico when he comes bearing this gift; but personally I wish to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on the amendment. I think this would help it survive the conference committee if it were to pass.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course, there are Greeks and Greeks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that the Greeks as a nation probably had the greatest ability of all the nations in the world, and I meant no reflection on the Senator from New Mexico by implying that his gifts as a chairman might be those of a Greek. I merely wished to say that I have been taught by sad experience to be careful when a person offers a gift or a chairman takes an amendment "to conference."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there are some Greeks for whom I have a great deal of respect. Therefore, I consider the Senator's remark a compliment to me.

However, when the Senator from Illinois said he did not wish to injure the Government employees, I am reminded of a man in my home State who was fishing for trout. He made a number of casts, and finally pulled out a beautiful 12-inch trout. He said, "What a beautiful trout this is. I will not hurt it. It is simply beautiful. I will not harm it at all; all I am going to do is gut it."

It seems to me that the Senator from Illinois takes a somewhat similar stand in regard to the effect of the amendment he has submitted. He tells us that he does not wish to harm the Government employees; he says he loves them and knows they are fine. However, he proposes that the Senate take action in a way which would be most harmful to them.

Mr. President, I have agreed to take the amendment to conference, and I made that statement in all sincerity.

When I make such an agreement, I expect to act in accordance with it in exactly the same way the Senator from Illinois would act under similar circumstances. When I am instructed by this body to press for the adoption of an amendment in the committee of conference, I follow out the instructions to the very best of my ability and in all sincerity.

No Senator should think that he is the only honest Member of this body. I have the utmost confidence in the integrity and sincerity of purpose of every Member of the Senate. Regardless of any differences of opinion which we might have as to the desirability of including in the bill any particular amendment, far be it from me ever to suggest that any Senator—on either side of the aisle—is not just as honest as I am. Some Senators may not have the same opinion of the amendment that I do; in fact, I am opposed to the amendment. Nevertheless, I understand what the Senate wishes to have done. Certainly as one member of the committee of conference I will not attempt to thwart the purpose of the Senate.

I take my duty as a Senator very seriously. When I became a Member of this body, I swore to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and I swore that I took that obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion. I believe in constitutional government and I believe in majority rule. The Congress has passed some laws which I do not believe to be correct and proper ones, but I obey those laws because the Congress has passed them.

I want all other Senators to share my feelings in regard to these matters. If we do not have faith in the integrity of each other—faith in the integrity of all Members of this body—there is no use in our proceeding further. I thank the good Lord that I have faith in my fellow citizens and in my colleagues in this body—even my fellow Republicans.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Hear! Hear!

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think they are just as fine, just as honest, just as sincere, just as patriotic, and just as loyal as any Democrat.

If the Senate passes this appropriation bill this afternoon, whatever the Senate decides in that connection is what I, as one of the conferees, will endeavor to carry out in the conference committee, in conjunction with the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. President, Senators speak of achieving economy, but I point out that we have already taken 5 days in the consideration of this bill. It costs money for the Senate to be in session. Therefore, why cannot we vote now?

I accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, first I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether the amendment will really result in reducing the leave of Government employees to 20 days of annual leave and 12 days of sick leave.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Then I raise a point of order against the

amendment. I thought the amendment was only a restriction on the appropriation bill. There is quite a difference between the two. As I read the amendment, it would not change the present leave of Government workers from 26 days to 20 days, but still would allow them to have 26 days of annual leave. If I am mistaken about that, I raise a point of order against the amendment, namely, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, in that it would change the amount of annual leave of Government employees from 26 days to 20 days.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment provides that no funds shall be paid for annual leave in excess of 20 days. Government workers could take additional annual leave at their own expense, if they wished to do so. The amendment would not prevent them from doing that, but would merely bar the appropriation and expenditure of public funds for annual leave in excess of 20 days. Therefore, I submit that the amendment constitutes a restriction, and not legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Therefore, according to the Senator's statement, the amendment, if adopted, would not reduce the annual leave of Government workers from 26 days to 20 days. I wish the Senate to understand that, in the first place. Even if the amendment is adopted, the annual leave of Government workers will continue to be 26 days; the amendment, if adopted, would not change the amount of their annual leave, but would merely restrict the amount of the appropriation which could be used in paying for the annual leave of Government workers. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We believe that if we restrict the amount of money which the Government can pay for annual leave, by providing that these funds may not be used to pay for more than a maximum of 20 days of annual leave, we shall effect these savings; and we have a shrewd surmise that probably not many Government employees will voluntarily take annual leave in excess of 20 days. However, the latter is strictly conjectural.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, let us consider the amendment a little further. It is easy for a Senator to submit an amendment, and often it is easy to have an amendment adopted by the Senate. I believe in listening to the views of the members of the committee who work faithfully and hard on the bills they report to the Senate. I believe that my colleagues also believe that we should listen carefully to the stated views of the chairman of the subcommittee which held the hearings on this particular bill.

I understand the Senator from Illinois to argue, in favor of adoption of the amendment, that "Often the Government employees get an additional day of leave when a celebrity comes to Washington from another country." However, Mr. President, I point out that not all of the employees of the Federal Government live in Washington. As a matter of fact, only about one-tenth of them live in Washington.

So let us consider the facts in connection with this matter.

Let me also point out that if the amendment were adopted and finally became a part of the bill as enacted, a Federal Government employee who expected to be paid from this appropriation probably would take 20 days of annual leave in the coming year, and would let the other 6 days of his annual leave accumulate and be taken in a subsequent year. In that way he would take only 20 days in the year which would be affected by this appropriation bill.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am not an attorney, and I do not now profess to be speaking in legal terms, but it seems to me that if there is a statute on the books which provides that a Federal employee shall receive 26 days of annual leave, then if, in an appropriation bill, we restrict the actual amount to be paid for the period of annual leave merely to compensation for 20 days, we shall still stand morally responsible as a congressional body for the additional 6 days' pay. It is an indebtedness which the Government would owe the employee. The employee may not receive it this year, but the Government will be owing the employee for 6 days of annual leave, in every moral sense, under the statute.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From a moral standpoint, I grant that the Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct. That is one of my reasons for being on the Senate floor today. My committee, which was criticized a few moments ago, has been working on this question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if I may make the point of order, I did not criticize the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I beg to differ with the Senator. The Senator criticized the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I criticized the Government departments for not cooperating fully with the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator criticized the committee for not having taken action on the question of leave. However, if the Senator says he did not intend it as a criticism of the committee, that is satisfactory to me. But I am saying to the Senate that my committee, working with the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, has been working on this very subject in an effort to make provision which we could consider equitable to all Government employees.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to inquire whether any Senator has a bill which he intends to introduce or whether a bill has been introduced to do what the Senator from Illinois has attempted to do by his amendment to the appropriation bill.

Is there an authorization bill? Is there something entirely different in

character? Has such a bill been introduced?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Such a bill was introduced. It is Senate bill 832. We referred the bill to the various commissions and departments.

Mr. IVES. Who introduced the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At the moment, I merely have the number of the bill. It is Senate bill 832.

Mr. IVES. How many Senators joined in introducing the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not recall; but it is before my committee. My committee has made an extensive study of the question. I am now able to tell the Senator from New York that the bill to which I refer was introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the study which the Senator's committee made was made as the result of the two bills which I introduced at the last session?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator's bills started it off. I give him all the credit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not ask for any credit. I merely want to have the RECORD straight, that is all.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But it should be remembered that the bill this year was a new bill. When it was referred to our committee, following the usual custom, a copy of the bill was referred to the various interested departments. They, in turn, have written to us, and they have stated that, as the result of their study, some way ought to be devised which would make it possible for a new employee to receive during his first year, probably not so much as an employee who has been working for the Government for a period of 10 or 15 years. I think Senators will acknowledge the propriety of that. But, by this amendment, all Federal employees would be treated alike.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I want to say that everything the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has said is true. We have been conducting hearings on this highly complicated subject. For example, in Alaska, the situation in regard to Federal employees is entirely different from that in the State of California in regard to the matter of giving the Federal employees more time and more sick leave.

That is not all. There are various occupations which are highly dangerous. I refer particularly to mining, for example, in connection with which people work for the Federal Government in certain mines under conditions which affect adversely their health.

So the question is a very complicated one. It is very easy to say that we shall

simply cut off 6 days, but it is a very difficult matter to make a proper application of it.

Furthermore, there is involved the problem of maternity, the problem connected with the birth of a child to a woman working for the Federal Government. We have conducted many hearings on the subject. We have had hearing after hearing.

There are other problems connected with abnormal conditions. There are various diseases which incapacitate employees for varying lengths of time. It might be said that a woman employed by the Government should have only a few days of sick leave, when, as a matter of fact, doctors have testified that sickness sometimes incapacitates employees for long periods of time.

Again, in World War II, the suggestion was made suddenly that Government employees work Saturday afternoons. Later, they were told to work part time on Sunday, and they did. I submit that the committee which now has a bill before it should have the right to consider carefully all the various angles, and that we ought not to adopt this amendment merely because to do so would seem to be the popular thing. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Along the line of the argument submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYEL], in which he spoke merely of a moral obligation, is it not true that, until the Congress itself changes the period of leave from 26 days, as it is now, to 20 days, or to whatever lesser number of days it desires, there would not only be a moral obligation but also a legal obligation imposed upon the Federal Government to observe the present law? Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Speaking without having looked into the matter thoroughly from a legal standpoint, I would say, as a lawyer, that that is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator not also agree that, even if the amendment of the Senator from Illinois were adopted, any Government employee could file an action in the United States Court of Claims, through which he could possibly succeed in collecting that to which the law says he is entitled?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my opinion, he could certainly go to the United States Court of Claims. It would then be a question for the court to determine.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So it is more than a moral obligation, although that should be considered as the important controlling factor. Nevertheless, there is also a legal obligation.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina whether he made a point of order against this amendment? I did not understand that he did.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall make a point of order, if it is proposed to reduce the employees' leave from 26 days to 20.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator made the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have not made it as yet.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the studies which were made, was any testimony introduced to show that Government employees work as few as 209 to 212 days a year, as was stated here a moment ago?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Something of the kind was said.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not true that many Federal workers do not take sick leave and that they take pride in the fact that they do not take sick leave?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. A good many of them do not take sick leave; that is true.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not also true that the eight holidays do not always fall on the working days of the week, but sometimes fall on Sunday?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that, if a holiday falls on a Sunday, the employees get an additional holiday?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is not always the case.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad the Senator answered as he did, "not always," because I have seen some Government employees—I have not seen all of them—but I have seen a great many Government employees who have worked day after day, regardless of whether they were entitled to holidays. There are employees who are at work day after day, and they remain at work, whether it happens to be a 5-day week or a 6-day week. I know employees who work long hours. I do not deny that there are some who sometimes do very little, but I also remember that I never left the Department of Agriculture, even though it might be as late as 11 or 12 o'clock at night, when there was not a light burning in some other person's office, where he was working far into the night, and working without extra pay.

I do not believe the merits are all on one side, as has been suggested here. There are employees who always take advantage of an opportunity, but I want to suggest that there are a great many Government employees who do not take their sick leave, and who take pride in the fact that they do not take sick leave—and there are dozens of them, hundreds of them, even thousands of them, working here in Washington.

As to a day being taken off when there is a parade down the streets of Washington, I do not believe there is an employee in the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, working in a State such as that of the distinguished minority leader, who takes the day off because there is a parade in Washington. I do not believe the delivery of mail is stopped in Keokuk, Kankakee, or Chicago, because there is a parade in Washington.

I think we are being a little unjust to the Federal employees.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator will check the language of the amendment he will notice that it is clearly a limitation upon the use of funds in this bill, and as such it does not and cannot affect the legal right of a Government employee to 26 days of annual leave and 15 days of sick leave, if necessary. If the philosophy of the amendment is that because of the emergency we should endeavor to induce employees not to take their full statutory sick leave or annual leave, it might be justified. But it would not be justified on the ground of economy, because it simply puts off the evil day when the Government will be required to pay for the accumulated leave. It will be paid when the individual takes it, at a later time, or when the individual is separated from the service of the Government, in which case it becomes terminal leave.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct. It simply postpones the time of payment. It does not prevent the taking of 26 days annual leave or 15 days sick leave. It does not change the number of days of leave for the employees, but simply puts off to another year the payment of it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The committee, in considering this question, also had another problem, namely, the case of an employee who had worked for the Government 15, 20, 25, or 30 years. The committee felt that those who had worked longer should have more sick leave and vacation than the ones who had worked only a year or 3 or 4 or 5 years.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. One of the things we found in our investigation was that as people grow older they need a little more leave. When a man takes a position at the age of 21, he may not need much annual leave. After 10 years of service, he would probably need more leave than he needed after 5 years of service. I should like to see a saving of approximately \$200,000,000 effected to the taxpayers of the United States, but the amendment now offered will not save one cent, in the long run.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the committee expect to finish its study of the problem and bring some proposal to the Senate for action in the near future?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have received letters from the Commission. I can read to the Senator a letter dated June 11. But we wanted to wait to get reports from whatever department would be affected, just as is done by any other committee. Let me read the letter we received on the 11th day of June.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator please state when he addressed his inquiry to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. On February 9, 1951.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When did he receive the letter from the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. On June 11.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, they waited 4 months, and only after the Senator from Illinois filed his amendment did the Civil Service Commission take a stand on the question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know whether it was because of what the Senator from Illinois did, or whether the Commission waited until it had finished its investigation so it could make a proper report to us.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was my purpose to try to ascertain when we might properly deal with the problem. I think the position taken by some Senators is correct, that this particular amendment simply limits the amount of pay out of the appropriation in the pending bill. I think employees will probably still be entitled to the extra 6 days leave when they want to take it. It is my opinion that it will accumulate. This is a problem which should be dealt with as early as we can deal with it, and when it is properly dealt with, considerable savings will be effected. I believe the present law to be unfair; there are inequities in it, and advantages are afforded which are not deserved.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator; but we must remember that there are leaves of various kinds in various places, and dealing with the question by one amendment on the floor of the Senate is not so simple a problem as some people think.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with what the Senator from Arkansas has just said. Many Senators believe that 26 days of annual leave in every case is too much, and that 15 days of sick leave in every case is too much, but for a long term of service it may be that extra sick leave and extra annual leave might be desirable. I hope the Senator will report some measure to the Senate so that we can take action.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I have a question which relates to the matter of saving under this amendment. I should like to have the Senator from Illinois give his attention to the question also. As I understood the Senator's statement, he expected the amendment would save ap-

proximately \$5,000,000 in this particular bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And in subsequent appropriation bills a total of \$250,000,000 would be saved.

Mr. BENNETT. This is my question: By reducing the amount of money paid for leave, without changing the gross total of a particular department, do we not release that gross fund for the department to spend for other purposes, so that, in effect, we save nothing?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We make it possible for the department to operate with a smaller number of employees.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very anxious to effect savings but I believe I am correct in my feeling that simply paying for 20 days instead of for 26 days, with the other 6 days accumulating as an obligation against the Government, which will eventually have to be paid for until and unless the basic law is changed, is not a sound proposition. The only way we can actually effect a saving is to get a bill reported from the committee as early as possible and deal with it on the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would be an expense to the Government if we appropriated additional money to provide for those 6 days, but by a continued refusal to appropriate we could prevent the amount from being paid.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. There have been too many cases decided in the Court of Claims to leave us in any doubt that the statement of the Senator is as fallacious as it can be. Claims have been paid to the Ute Indians in connection with a matter which arose in 1850. The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was correct in his statement a minute ago. The amendment does not save \$5,000,000 or 5,000,000 cents. It simply postpones payment until a later date.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. It seems to the Senator from New York that ultimately the only possible saving that could be made would result from the fact that the amount which might be owed would be paid in currency. The currency may have depreciated under its present value. Heaven forbid that that shall ever happen, and heaven forbid that that is the process by which we effect savings.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to advise the Senator from South Carolina that I appreciate the effort he has expended, and I should like to join the Senator from

Minnesota and the other Senators who have expressed themselves to the effect that we shall never be in favor of doing something through the back door that we do not have the courage to do through the front door. I feel that the Senator from South Carolina is correct, and I shall support him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator.

I think the Senate understands that the pending amendment would save nothing, but would only postpone to another year what we are legally obligated to do this year, unless we enact legislation to take care of the matter.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to say that I am deeply impressed with what the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from South Carolina have said about governmental obligations. I think every Member of the Senate who has been Governor of a State can speak from experience that that is the fact. Time and time again, when the Legislature of the State of New York failed to make appropriation to cover the costs of carrying out the provisions of a statute which was passed in that State, the State immediately became liable to claims, which were always met. So until the statute can be changed I do not believe that there can possibly be any savings by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

CONTROL AND CURE OF CANCER— LETTER FROM CHARLES W. TOBEY, JR.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senate has under consideration an appropriation bill which provides an appropriation for research into various diseases which affect the human body, and I have a particular interest in such legislation, because two members of my family are afflicted with subtle and terrible diseases, which have been the source of sorrow and anxiety to me and still are.

This morning I received a letter from my son, who bears my name and is a practicing lawyer in Concord, N. H. Some 3 or 4 years ago he came down with an attack of illness which was diagnosed as cancer, a virulent form, and gave those of us to whom he is precious tremendous apprehension and anxiety. We sought the best medical advice obtainable, but not much hope was given. However, he learned of a treatment given by a doctor in Medford, Mass. Following these treatments, now of about 3 years' duration, he has been so impressed with the results which have accrued in his case, results which have allowed him to continue to carry on his law business, to be extremely active in forwarding my campaign for election in 1950, and to live a normal life, that he feels he has an obligation and a responsibility to release that testimony of the benefits which have accrued to him and to several others whose cases have come to his attention

and which he has observed since the beginning of their treatment. He has been so moved by his feeling of interest in his fellow men who may be suffering from the threats and ravages of cancer, he felt it was his duty to write to me and ask me to insert his letter in the body of the RECORD, which I ask unanimous consent to do at this point.

This is done in the hope that some other unfortunates may find improvement and betterment in line with what has come to him and the other cases which he mentioned in his letter. Therefore, I ask, Mr. President, that this letter be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in the further hope that it may come to the attention of some of the great institutions of the country whose officers may want to inquire into it for their own research work.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

CONCORD, N. H., June 12, 1951.

The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAD: I am writing this letter to you in the hope that what is written here will give incentive to cancer research institutes and clinics to investigate and evaluate a research program which has apparently demonstrated its ability to arrest and dissipate cancerous growth.

Through treatment in our own family you have become acquainted with the research program of Dr. Robert E. Lincoln, of Medford, Mass. It was about 3 years ago that I became his first cancer patient. You will recall that following long medical treatment and a period of hospitalization, you were advised by our family physicians that I had been stricken with an incurable and rapidly growing cancer. That was the year before I commenced treatment with Dr. Lincoln. The diagnosis of reticulum cell lymphosarcoma was confirmed at Tufts Medical School and reaffirmed at Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons. I cannot say, of course, that Dr. Lincoln's treatments are totally responsible for my present state of good health, but having received reports of improvements of other cancer victims who had been under Dr. Lincoln's care, I am deeply convinced that here is a medical discovery that should be investigated at once for the possible benefit of many thousands of homes in America that have been stricken and that will be stricken each month of each year to come.

Following his discharge from service in World War I, Dr. Lincoln obtained his doctorate of medicine in 1926 and became engaged in a coordinated plan of the general practice of medicine together with a collateral research program. He devised an original type of mechanical heart pump and did basic research work in supersonic energy as he applied it to the field of medicine. This latter research work was done under the immediate direction of Prof. George W. Pierce at the Laboratory of Applied Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge.

For the past 25 years he has practiced general medicine in Medford, Mass., where at the same time, he has conducted his research program. He has made a study of viral infection throughout this period. About 5 years ago he succeeded in isolating from patients during certain stages of epidemic infections, certain viruses from which bacteriophages were made. The results which, over the past 5 years, have been constantly observed in patients having various acute and chronic diseases, would strongly indicate that Dr. Lincoln has been

successful in isolating the basic viruses and their specific cellular elements that are the cause of these infectious epidemic diseases.

In order to carefully evaluate each patient as they take their treatments every other day, the doctor has limited his research program to an average of 20 to 30 patients daily. From time to time, during the past 3 years, I have seen and talked with a great many of these people and have seen their hospital and clinic reports of their diagnoses and treatments prior to coming to Dr. Lincoln's clinic. The results in these cases, most of whom had been regarded as hopeless by hospitals and medical institutions, have almost invariably demonstrated a steady improvement.

Last October I received an urgent phone call from a total stranger. He had learned of Dr. Lincoln and of the fact that I had been treated by him. This man had a serious cancer problem in his family in which a recurrence was taking place. At the time he called me X-rays showed that certain tissues were being eaten away. I advised him to visit Dr. Lincoln at once with his wife. X-rays which were taken at regular intervals as the treatments went on showed that as early as 40 days after commencement of treatments, the malignant process was not only arrested but that a replacement of normal tissue was taking place. He had been advised by both Boston and New York specialists that his wife's case was incurable and that she would probably not live longer than a period of 6 months. She advised me, following 1 week of treatment, that most of her pain had disappeared. This patient has now outlived her estimated duration of life by several months.

I have before me a letter written a few days ago by a mother who had a complete breast amputation in August of 1949, due to the presence of a malignant growth. Following a periodic X-ray check-up in February of 1951, her family physician advised her that he had received a disturbing report from the X-ray specialist. Further X-ray pictures which were taken at a prominent Boston hospital confirmed this report. Subsequently, tissue removed for biopsy examination confirmed the diagnosis of cancer. X-ray pictures showed malignant invasion of one of her lungs.

She was first treated by Dr. Lincoln last March. Within the past week inquiry has revealed the following. An X-ray taken 6 weeks after the start of treatment was compared with her previous pictures. The X-ray specialist expressed surprise at the result which showed that the malignant spots had been checked. Her general physical condition was markedly improved.

The last case that I will mention is that of another woman. Following a pathologist's biopsy examination, a diagnosis of carcinoma of the so-called sigmoid portion of the lower bowel or colon was made. The cancer had spread to the neighboring organs, so much so that a complete hysterectomy was done. A colostomy, or false opening of the intestine through the abdominal wall was also performed. This occurred in May of 1950.

Seven months later severe pain again returned and examination showed that her cancer had recurred. Her husband was told that it would be useless to operate again and was advised to bring her home.

There was such a rapid deterioration of her general condition that four months later she was unable to support herself in an erect sitting position in bed. There was constant nausea. At this point her husband describes her condition as follows:

"She was vomiting about four to five times daily, and was being given regular hypodermic injections of drugs to relieve her pain. Her weight had fallen from 155 pounds on February 1, 1951, to 112 pounds

on May 18, when she commenced treatments with Dr. Lincoln, a total loss of 43 pounds. The morning following the first treatment, she showed her first real desire for food in several months. She kept this food down and has continued to do so up to the present time" (June 1).

I understand from the doctor that this patient has shown steady progress to a point where she now equally divides her time between bed rest and being up and about. She is now practically free from pain. A continuous and severe burning sensation throughout the entire abdomen, which was due to a chronic colitis of long standing, has disappeared. The rapid loss of weight was not only stopped, but there has been a slight gaining of weight since the starting of treatment.

As you know, the evaluation of the component parts of Dr. Lincoln's therapy, together with his clinical results, have been largely corroborated by a number of other investigators working independently. Each one has attested to the therapeutic utility and individual efficiency of Dr. Lincoln's antibiotic agents.

As you can most easily understand, in view of the invasion of our own home by cancer, I am particularly anxious to do all that I can to make this particular treatment available to as many people as possible in the shortest period of time. The medications used in this research work will not be available for widespread distribution until its manufacture has been placed on a commercial level. The present facilities are such that this treatment can be available only for a limited amount of organized research work at the present time.

I have in mind that the four cancer cases that I have cited are by no means conclusive proof of the efficacy of Dr. Lincoln's therapies as comprising the total answer to the problem of malignancy. However, I have seen enough evidence of a decidedly positive nature, as gaged both by the doctor's own interpretations of his results, those of the corroborating investigators, together with the obvious and visible improvements that I myself have witnessed, to make me feel that every effort should be made to encourage further investigation.

Dr. Lincoln's successful isolation of these viral bodies and their means of propagation has opened the door to an entirely new and wide field of medical research. The results that he and his colleagues are obtaining in the treatment of victims of acute and chronic disease call for a rapidly increased expansion of clinical research along the same lines that have already been activated.

It is for these reasons that I am writing this letter to you, with the request that you place the contents hereof in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that various medical research groups may have this matter called to their attention, so that the people, as well as the medical research world, may be encouraged to look further into this new viral field of medical science.

In closing this letter, I would like to mention that Dr. Lincoln has made an irrevocable assignment of his discoveries and therapeutic agents to the Lincoln Foundation, a nonprofit organization dedicated solely to the furtherance of medical research. Accordingly, no monetary profit will ever accrue to any individual or group. He has dedicated his life to this work and has so assigned these antibiotics as to insure continued and increased medical research to the end that the people may be the perpetual beneficiaries of these discoveries.

You and I, as father and son, have worked together over the years on a great many matters that we have felt have been of vital concern to the country and the people. Having lived the subject matter of this letter

over the past few years, I am glad to be able to come to you and to have your help and cooperation in this new work.

With my best to you always,
Sincerely,

CHARLES W. TOBEY, Jr.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe I should say one or two words about the amendment. I had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished and able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service last year, and having looked into this matter considerably, I am of the opinion that there is really no basis upon which we can justify the large amount of leave that the Federal employees are receiving. I know that employees of the Post Office Department and their union officials came to me and urged that the Post Office employees should have more leave. When we looked into their need for leave we found that they could not make a particularly strong case, except that they could say that the civil-service employees were receiving so much leave, and therefore that they should receive the same amount.

But after studying the question further it was my conclusion, as a member of the committee—and I believe I was the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the subject at that time—that it is rather unfair to ask the average American worker to pay taxes and receive very little leave himself, in order to pay the expense of someone else receiving an enormous amount of leave that could not be justified. That, to me, seems to be unfair to those who are paying for these conditions for Federal employees.

The point was made, and very correctly so, by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that he knows of many Federal employees who do not take that leave. That is entirely true, and it goes further to demonstrate, to my mind at least, that they receive too much leave, so that they really have little need for all the leave they accumulate.

If I might cite an example fairly close to me; my own administrative assistant worked for a Federal agency for some time. After 5 years he would have been entitled to draw up to 124 days' leave. During those 5 years he drew about 40 days' leave. It happened that he was very busy at his job, and could not find time to take the leave. He was in a responsible position, and in order to do his work as it should be done he could not find time to take all the leave granted under Federal law.

It has been pointed out that the leave runs somewhere around 40 percent of the the days of the year. Many employees find that they do not particularly care to take that much leave, but they do rather like to accumulate it, so in the event their services are terminated they would be entitled to draw additional pay for the days of leave to which they were entitled, but of which they did not take advantage.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield after I say that I had in mind that the days of leave include Saturdays and Sundays, sick leave, annual leave, and holidays, which run approximately 153 days.

Mr. ANDERSON. I question that.

Mr. LONG. Well, 104 days represent Saturdays and Sundays. That figure is not difficult to arrived at. Fifteen days for sick leave, 26 days for annual leave, and 8 holidays.

Mr. ANDERSON. Can the Senator from Louisiana pick out a year in which eight holidays come on working days? He stated a moment ago that employees took leave regardless, but the very case of the Senator's administrative assistant proves that employees do not do so. That only shows that the Senator ought to know more Government employees. I am sure if he knew more Government employees he would find that many hundreds and hundreds of them do the very same thing the Senator's administrative assistant did.

Mr. LONG. I have the very highest admiration for Government employees, and always will have. The point I wish to make, however, is that here is a case of Government employees receiving far more leave than they feel they should take. Here is a case of a Government employee receiving three times more time off at the Federal Government's expense than he feels he can find time to take, believing he is responsible for getting a certain job done. The Senator from New Mexico himself pointed out examples of leaving his office and finding employees who were entitled to leave, still working at their jobs. That is not a case of doing work that they are required to do. It is a case of their volunteering to do over and above the amount of work they are required to do.

I know that Senators are sometimes inconvenienced because of the fact that there are many holidays on which Government employees do not work. Sometimes when we are trying to do work for our constituents we are not able to accomplish it because we cannot do business with Government offices since there are no employees in those offices, especially on Saturdays.

The argument was made to me that employees must have additional time, more than the post office employees get, in order to go home to vote. Actually, my experience has been that there are very few employees who must go home to vote. Most of them who could do so do not. There are much better absentee-voter laws for the benefit of persons who wish to vote but who are not in their States at the time of the elec-

tion than there were at the time the leave situation was created.

It has also been urged that originally the justification for so much leave was based upon the idea that most Federal employees were in Washington, and that they required about 3 days' travel time to get home and 3 days' travel time to get back to Washington. That situation no longer prevails in the main, because most Federal employees are no longer situated in Washington. In the second place, methods of communication and transportation being what they are, and transportation having become so much more rapid since the leave situation was created, there is no longer a requirement of 3 or 4 days' travel time to go home and several additional days to come back to Washington. Therefore, I believe that sooner or later the public is going to wonder why we do not reduce the amount of leave.

I hope I shall not be misunderstood on the question of the amount of leave which I think is available to Federal employees. I understand that there are 26 days annual leave, and usually about 8 holidays. The junior Senator from Louisiana was under the impression that with respect to most holidays, if the holiday falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the succeeding day is a day of vacation, to allow for that fact.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that some action should be taken by the Congress. If we are to take action, what form should that action take? So far as I can see, the only action which has been taken affecting leave while the junior Senator from Louisiana has been in Congress has been action taken on appropriation bills. I consider that rather unfortunate. Having served as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I believe that that is the proper committee to consider such legislation; yet the committee never got around to it while the junior Senator from Louisiana was a member of the committee, and has not gotten around to it up to this time.

It is my impression that if we put the Congress on record that we do not believe there should be 26 days annual leave, by voting for the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois, with all the defects which might be pointed out in that amendment, at least a start will have been made and I believe that we shall be able to devise a method to surmount the legal defects, and finally obtain a reduction of the excessive leave, such as we probably should have.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the amendment of the Senator from Illinois stands as it is, there seems to be grave doubt that it will save any money. The reason the Senator from Michigan says that is that the following provision is inserted in the independent offices bill:

SEC. 601. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this or any other act, including the government of the District of Columbia, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any civilian

officer or employee during the calendar year 1951 and unused at the close of business on June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States: *And provided further*, That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator inform me whether the measure to which he is referring is already on the statute books of the Nation, or whether it is merely language in a bill which the House has passed?

Mr. FERGUSON. The House passed it in the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. LONG. That is not the law. It will have to come before the Senate, and be considered in conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; but without that sort of provision in the pending bill, limiting it to this year, and limiting the amount that may be paid, I do not see how we are going to save any money.

Mr. LONG. I agree with the Senator that from a legislative point of view the amendment might be more in line with what I should like to see, actually to accomplish the result we are seeking.

However, if the senior Senator from Illinois had phrased his amendment as he would probably have liked to phrase it, a point of order would have been made against his amendment, and he would have been in the position of being required to move to suspend the rule. He would have been subjected to a further delay of 1 day in order to give notice of a motion to suspend the rule. Therefore he would not have been able to get a vote on his amendment. It would have been sidetracked, and we would not have had any action.

I believe that the senior Senator from Illinois acted quite wisely under the circumstances. Certainly he knows that if he is able to obtain approval for this amendment, sooner or later he will be able to accomplish what he is trying to do. If this amendment will not actually save money, he will be able to get more effective language in a future appropriation bill, and have the rule suspended, so as to result in a saving of \$125,000,000, which the senior Senator from Illinois seeks to save. That, I believe, would be a proper economy.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. KERR. As I understand the Senator from Louisiana, he tells us that if this amendment is enacted it will not save any money, but that it will be persuasive as an expression of sentiment on the part of the Senate with reference to the desirability of legislation similar to this, which would save money.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana understands this amendment to say that funds appropriated for the agencies with which we are dealing here cannot be spent to pay for annual leave in excess of 20 days a year. The money would simply not be spent in that fash-

ion. The argument is made that that provision, standing alone, would mean that possibly the employees might at a later date come back and receive pay for annual leave in addition to that which they might have actually earned. If that argument is correct, then it is true that this amendment would not accomplish what it seeks to accomplish. However, as a practical matter, I point out that if this amendment carries by a substantial vote, even with all the defects anyone might point out in it, the probabilities are that in connection with the next appropriation bill we shall succeed in suspending the rule and placing a rider in that bill which will accomplish exactly what the senior Senator from Illinois seeks to accomplish.

As a practical matter, the junior Senator from Louisiana is of the opinion that if we defeat this amendment we shall go along for another 2 or 3 years, still paying for 26 days annual leave, and that if we adopt this amendment, the probabilities are that we shall succeed during this session—probably in the near future—in so correcting the leave situation that the leave will be more in line with what it probably should be.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. What is the opinion of the Senator from Louisiana as to whether or not this amendment, if adopted, would be effective in saving any money?

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana feels certain that for this year it would prevent that money from being paid out. That is exactly what it says it would do.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana is also strongly of the opinion that if this amendment is adopted particularly if it is adopted by a large vote—the Senate will act on this subject again within a month; and possibly even before the pending appropriation bill becomes law we may enact legislation, in connection with some other appropriation bill, sufficient to see to it that any defect which the Senator now points out in this amendment is cured from a legal point of view.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator think that if at this time there is a legal liability on the part of the Government to pay this money to the employee, and if the total effect of this amendment would be merely to provide that the money should not be paid out of current appropriations, the inevitable result would be that the employees would have a valid claim against the Government, and thereby the Government would be in the position of owing the money and declining to pay it, which would create confusion rather than accomplish the result which the Senator has in mind, with which I am thoroughly in accord?

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Louisiana is strongly of the opinion that if the amendment is adopted, the result will be that during this session Con-

gress will express its will to reduce the amount of annual leave. If the amendment does not carry, the probabilities are that we will get no action on the subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a little earlier, I read from a section of the independent offices bill, but I neglected to make special mention of a particular provision in that section. I invite the attention of the Senate to the provision, section 601, in the independent offices bill, and to the following words in that section:

No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this or any other act—

That language makes it general legislation. The use of the words "or any other act" makes the provision general in application. It even includes the District of Columbia, which confirms that it is general legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In reply to the Senator from Michigan, I would say that what he has stated confirms the position I am taking. The amendment would prohibit money being expended in this year for leave in excess of 20 days. The provision to which the Senator from Michigan invites attention indicates that such leave cannot be stored up for the future.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore there would be no future liability to the Government. The Senator from Michigan has confirmed my argument.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, assuming the provision in the independent offices bill is ultimately enacted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee which is about to report the independent offices bill I should like to say that this amendment is legislation. There was incorporated in the independent offices bill the provision to which reference has been made because of the confusion we had last year in connection with the so-called Rent Control Board.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the question of accumulated leave, we found that in that agency there was a great amount of accumulated leave which was imposing future liability upon the Government not in harmony with current operations.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in favor of evening up the leave between the Post Office employees and employees of the other agencies. However, we have provision for such legislation in the bill which will be considered by the Senate tomorrow or the next day, which will take care of the situation. As I understand the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], we are concerned not with a matter of legislation, but a matter of court decision, and therefore, we cannot save any money.

Mr. LONG. It has been argued that there is an obligation on the part of the Government to pay.

Mr. MAYBANK. So far as the independent offices appropriation bill is concerned, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether such a provision would be legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. A point of order could not be raised against it, because it is contained in the House bill as it came to the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the Senator is referring to the independent offices bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make a suggestion. I wish to reduce expenditures. I believe in this time of crisis and emergency it is not unreasonable to ask Federal employees to take only 20 days' leave with pay. I do not believe that to be unreasonable at all. However, I should like to accomplish it without simply limiting their pay and still retaining a continuing obligation to pay later. Inasmuch as the only way to correct the situation is by legislation, I should like to suggest that the amendment be withdrawn, and that a proper amendment, in the form of legislation, be made to apply to all appropriation bills for 1952. By suspending the rules of the Senate we could have such a provision apply to every appropriation bill. That is the right way to do it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may I ask whether the Senator from Arkansas voted for the amendment to the independent offices bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill will be reported tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I suggest that we suspend the rules in order to legislate on the question. In the interim I hope the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service will go into the question and report new basic legislation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Louisiana a question. He was the chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with questions of this kind. He is familiar with them. If we were to adopt the amendment, making the limitation and cutting down the leave to 20 days, the effect would be to throw a block in the way of the legislation on which we are now working. I should like to read a letter which I received from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that the letter which was written 4 months after the Commission was requested for the information?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to read it into the RECORD, so that Senators will be familiar with the facts. It says:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE

COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., June 11, 1951.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,

Chairman, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, United States Senate, Room 134, Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: This is in further reply to your letter of February 9, 1951, requesting the Commission's views concerning S. 832, a bill to reduce the annual leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes.

The Commission opposes the enactment of S. 832. As you know, the facts developed by the joint study recently made for your Committee by the Bureau of the Budget and the Commission show that the savings to the Government as a result of a graduated

system similar to that discussed by your staff would be greater than those resulting from a flat cut to 15 or 20 days for all employees. Such a plan is now in use in a number of industrial concerns. While the Commission is not making a recommendation at this time to reduce the leave of Federal employees, it is believed that any change in the leave system should contemplate a graduated scale whereby the amount of annual leave granted employees would be related directly to the employee's length of service. In the Commission's opinion, a graduated system would also be more equitable to career employees.

The Bureau of the Budget has informed the Commission that it has no objections to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:

Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. MITCHELL,

Commissioner.

If the Senator from Louisiana goes along with the amendment he will be throwing a block in our way. We will be unable to do anything with regard to it, and we need not expect the Commission to do anything either.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator if he would be willing to offer an amendment providing for a graduated scale? If so, I would be willing to accept it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In reply to the Senator from Illinois I should like to say that we have a great many lawyers on the floor of the Senate. Nevertheless we have a staff working on the amendment. It is working out the details. It is not possible to bring up a suggested amendment on the floor of the Senate and do justice to the employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I fully understand the observations made by Senators on the floor. I would point out, however, that I am firmly of the opinion that if we are ever to succeed in reducing the amount of leave, we shall have to do it by way of an amendment to an appropriation bill. Otherwise, with the opposition which would come from various Government agencies, the complications which would be brought about by the opposition raised on the part of many organizations, as well as the pressure upon individual Senators, with no similar counterpressure from the taxpayers, who would have to pay the money involved, in the long run our efforts would probably go for naught. Therefore, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, on page 41, in line 24.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from North

Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—35

Aiken	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Nixon
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Jenner	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Wherry
Eastland	McClellan	Wiley
Ellender	Monroney	Williams
Ferguson	Moody	

NAYS—36

Anderson	Johnson, Colo.	McKellar
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Clements	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kilgore	Pastore
Eaton	Knowland	Russell
George	Langer	Sparkman
Green	Lehman	Thye
Hayden	Magnuson	Underwood
Humphrey	Maybank	Watkins
Hunt	McCarran	Welker
Ives	McFarland	Young

NOT VOTING—25

Benton	Frear	Millikin
Bricker	Fulbright	Murray
Cain	Gillette	O'Connor
Capehart	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Case	Kem	Smathers
Connally	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Malone	Tobey
Duff	Martin	
Flanders	McMahon	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senate has just turned down an opportunity to save \$250,000,000. I think that some of those who voted against this amendment did so in the belief that a bill on the subject should be reported to the Senate by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I believe we should give all encouragement to that committee immediately to proceed to its work. I therefore offer another amendment, as follows:

On page 41, line 24, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is hereby directed to report to the Senate on or before July 25, 1951, a bill providing that the annual and sick leave of Classified, Postal and Wage Board employees shall be set at 20 days annual leave per year and 12 days sick leave per year; provided further, That the Senate shall proceed to vote on such bill within 30 days after it shall have been reported."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina will state the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I make the point of order that the amendment is in the nature of legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator from Illinois yielded for that purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am making the point to save the time of the Senate, that is all, and because I know the amendment is out of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, we can always find all kinds of excuses for not acting. When an amendment is proposed to an appropriation bill, it is argued that we should take the matter up in a legislative bill.

Whenever we try to save money for the Government and for the people, it is always said that it is not being done in the right manner, nor at the right time, nor attached to the right bill. The pea is always underneath another shell and the poor taxpayer is worn out chasing it.

In the great shell game of economy, the taxpayer always seems to lose. I am trying to help him find the pea.

Some have said we should not try to cut annual leave on an appropriation bill, but should do so only on a legislative bill. Well, that is what I am now trying to do. I am trying to assure that those good friends get their expressed wish.

We know perfectly well the influences which are going to be at work to prevent action. Thousands of Government employees will be out in force, and it will

be most difficult to act. I know it would be rather rough on the committee to turn its members over to the tender mercies of all the various governmental agencies, unless we gave them some legislative direction. Under this proposal of mine members of the committee could say, "It is not our fault that we are taking this matter up. It is the fault of the Senate as a whole. The Senate is compelling us to report within 12 days, and the Senate must then act within 30 days."

If we really mean business about having this matter handled in a legislative bill, let us adopt this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as the chairman of a committee which is being directed what to do, and when to do it, I am not pleased at all with what is now proposed, and I do not think the chairman of any other committee of the Senate would appreciate it. This proposal would, if adopted, be the same as establishing a precedent binding upon every Member of the Senate, whereby the Senate could tell any committee having jurisdiction over a given subject that it must report a bill, whether the members of the committee believe in it or not. For the Senate to tell the committees what to do suggests that we should simply abolish all committees of the Senate and handle everything upon the floor of the Senate. That, Mr. President, seems to me is what we are facing today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may make a point of order?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I intend to make a point of order. But I feel that I ought to speak for my committee, and to tell Senators how I feel regarding a proposal of this kind.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. In doing that, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to any Senator on this floor to make a statement with reference to his conviction and his responsibility, and his recognition of his duties?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So far as I am concerned, when I was sent to the Senate of the United States I was sent here to do my own thinking and to do my own voting, and I intend to do that so long as I am a Senator from South Carolina. I shall not permit anyone from Illinois or from any other State to tell me what to do or what not to do. I think the members of my committee entertain the same feeling. So I make the point of order that this proposal is in the nature of legislation on an appropriation bill, and also that it is out of order for the reason that it would constitute a violation of the rules for the Senate to tell a committee what it must do in regard to a particular bill which may have been referred to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken, and is sustained.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is all very well for the Senator from Illinois

to talk about economy. It is all very well to have him feel that he is the only Member of this body who is trying to do what is right. But if the Senator from Illinois actually wanted to be consistent, he would let the Senate take action on the pending bill and get through with it. We have wasted much time today. I shall not say what I had in mind to say. We have wasted more of the taxpayers' money by discussing matters which the Senate knew about and understood than I can estimate. For the sake of economy, why not vote on the bill either one way or the other.

I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I withdraw my appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and offer instead another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the payment of remuneration for sick leave of any classified or Wage Board employee in excess of 12 days per year; or for the payment of remuneration for annual leave in excess of 13 days per year in the case of such an employee who has rendered a total of less than 5 years of active service as a civilian employee or in the Armed Forces of the United States, 19½ days per year in the case of such an employee who has rendered a total of 5 years but less than 15 years of such service, 26 days per year in the case of such an employee who has rendered a total of 15 years of such service."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I raise the point of order that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the amendment is in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are making every effort to present some measure on this subject which the Senate will adopt. When we propose a uniform cut of a certain number of days, it is said that it should be graduated. The amendment now offered provides for such a graduation, and I believe it is identical with the plan tentatively suggested by the staff of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The amendment will provide 13 days a year for those who have been employed less than 5 years, 19½ days for those who have been employed from 5 to 15 years, and 26 days for those who have been employed more than 15 years. This particular program has great administrative advantages. There are 26 pay periods of 2 weeks each during the Federal year. The days of leave suggested are fractions of 26. The amend-

ment would mean that an employee who has worked less than 5 years would get one-half day's leave per pay period, and those who have been employed for between 5 and 15 years will get three-fourths of a day for each pay period. Finally those employees who have served more than 15 years will receive 26 days, the same as now, or 1 day for each pay period.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. President, unless the Senator from South Carolina objects, I should like to have printed in the RECORD the very excellent report of the staff of the committee.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE,
April 17, 1951.

The Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office
and Civil Service,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: In accordance with your directions the staff has analyzed the joint report concerning the accumulated annual leave and length of service of Federal employees submitted to the Committee by the Bureau of Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

The report, based on this analysis, is submitted for the consideration of the committee.

This report is divided into nine parts:

Part I states the recommendations of the staff with regard to annual and sick leave and unemployment insurance.

Part II presents a brief analysis and conclusion of the different Federal leave systems.

Part III presents the justification for a graduated system of annual leave.

Part IV in brief compass describes a method for reduction in backlog of accumulated leave.

Part V is a brief conclusion regarding future accumulation of annual leave.

Part VI presents an analysis of sick-leave benefits, rate of usage and conclusion with specific recommendations.

Part VII describes method of bookkeeping that would save the Government much of the administrative costs with regard to records of accrued sick and annual leave.

Part VIII states the reason and need for unemployment insurance, provided certain leave cuts are adopted.

Part IX presents two schedules of graduated leave systems that should be considered.

Each schedule is divided into three parts: Length of service reported; basis for graduated system; and analysis of graduated system. The adoption of either schedule would save the Government over \$200,000,000 annually.

For the preparation of this report special acknowledgment is due Mr. Don Kerlin of the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

H. W. BRAWLEY,
Staff Director.

SICK AND ANNUAL LEAVE IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

PART I. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review the several annual- and sick-leave laws with a view to legislation establishing a uniform system throughout the Federal service to the greatest extent practicable.

2. Consider adoption of a graduated system of annual leave based on length of

service that will provide employees with adequate time for liberal vacations yearly and for incidental use, yet at the same time, conserve manpower and produce economies.

3. Consider means of forcing an orderly reduction in the large amount of accumulated annual leave to the credit of individual employees.

4. Consider means of preventing unduly large accumulations of annual leave by individual employees in the future.

5. Consider the sick-leave situation with a view to legislation that will reduce what appears to be a too liberal yearly allowance; remove the limitation on the amount of sick leave that may be accumulated in order to provide greater coverage to long-time employees during periods of serious and prolonged illness; and provide reasonable safeguards to minimize the possibility of abuse of the sick-leave privilege.

6. Consider legislative changes in both the annual- and sick-leave laws that will greatly reduce the cost of maintaining individual leave accounts.

7. Consider legislation to cover Federal employees with unemployment insurance, both as a matter of equity and to replace the widespread practice of building up large accumulations of annual leave as insurance against unemployment.

PART II. DIFFERENT FEDERAL LEAVE SYSTEMS

A. Among the several leave systems in effect in the Federal service are the following:

1. Federal employees generally: Approximately 75 percent of all Federal employees are subject to the Uniform Annual and Sick Leave Acts of 1936, as amended. These acts provide leave as follows:

Annual leave

(a) Permanent employees: Permanent full-time employees earn annual leave at the rate of 26 days per calendar year. Permanent part-time employees, for whom there has been established a regular tour of duty covering not less than 5 days in any week, earn annual leave on a pro rata basis.

(b) Temporary employees: Temporary full-time employees earn annual leave at the rate of 30 days per calendar year. Temporary part-time employees for whom there has been established a regular tour of duty covering not less than 5 days in any week earn annual leave on a pro rata basis during each full continuous month of service.

(c) Intermittent employees: Permanent or temporary employees whose services are required either full or part time or on intermittent basis do not earn annual leave provided the agency takes the precaution to notify the employee in writing to that effect at the time of his appointment.

(d) Accumulations: Employees in the United States now may accumulate annual leave in an amount not to exceed 60 days. During World War II (September 8, 1939 to July 25, 1947) employees were permitted to accumulate up to 90 days. Many employees still have such accumulations to their credit.

Employees outside the continental United States are permitted to accumulate annual leave in accordance with agency regulations in effect prior to January 1, 1936. These regulations permit accumulations of annual leave in varying amounts, ranging from 90 to 120 days.

Sick leave may be accumulated by employees both in and outside the continental United States in an amount not in excess of 90 days at the end of any calendar month.

2. Postal field service: Over 360,000 employees in the Postal Field Service are subject to Public Law 134, which grants 15 days annual leave per year and 10 days sick leave per year. By administrative action such employees are not permitted to carry over more than 5 days annual leave from one fiscal year to the next. However, there is no

restriction on the amount of sick leave they may accumulate. Departmental employees, postmasters, assistant postmasters, and certain other employees in the post offices throughout the country are subject to the Uniform Annual and Sick Leave Acts of 1936, as amended, and, therefore, earn and accumulate annual and sick leave in the same manner as other Federal employees.

3. Foreign Service—Department of State: Over 8,000 employees in the Foreign Service, Department of State, are subject to the Foreign Service Act of 1946, Public Law 724, in the matter of annual and sick leave. This Act gives such employees 60 calendar days annual leave and 15 calendar days sick leave per year. The Act permits an accumulation of annual leave in amount not to exceed 180 days and an accumulation of sick leave not to exceed 120 days.

4. Doctors, dentists, and nurses—Veterans' Administration: Several thousand medical employees in the Veterans' Administration are subject to Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, in the matter of sick and annual leave. This law grants annual leave at the rate of 30 calendar days per year and sick leave at the rate of 15 calendar days per year. The maximum accumulation of annual leave is not to exceed 120 days. The maximum accumulation of sick leave is not to exceed 90 days.

5. Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service: Approximately 2,300 commissioned officers of the Public Health Service are subject to a leave system under which they accrue annual leave at the rate of 30 calendar days per year and sick leave to the extent the Surgeon General considers justified by the circumstances involved. The accumulation of annual leave is limited to 60 days, but sick leave is granted on the basis of justification, without limitation.

6. Employees of the Government Printing Office: Some 7,000 employees of the Government Printing Office are subject to annual and sick leave laws which grant 30 and 15 days, respectively, each year. However, by administrative action, such employees have been brought under Uniform Annual and Sick Leave Acts for 1936, as amended.

7. Miscellaneous groups: Employees of the Panama Railroad Company, Panama Canal, Maritime Commission, certain field employees of the Department of Agriculture, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and employees of the United States Park Service are subject to a variation of leave laws.

B. Conclusion: The conditions of employment, hours of work, and basis of pay of each of the above groups should be thoroughly analyzed with the view to standardization of annual and sick leave laws insofar as may be practical and equitable. The various statutes and administrative directives governing the accumulation of annual leave for United States citizen employees in overseas areas should be standardized, as there is no justification for the wide variation in the amount of annual leave that can be accumulated by employees under like conditions.

PART III. GRADUATED SYSTEM OF ANNUAL LEAVE

A. A system of granting annual leave at a graduated rate based on the length of service of the individual employee has a great deal of merit. Such a practice prevails rather generally in private industry. However, it must be recognized that Federal employees, unlike employees in private industry, are required to charge every absence from official duty to some type of leave, in the main, either to their annual or sick leave account. In private industry, incidental leave for such purposes as paying taxes, attending funerals, car inspection, participation in civic enterprises, and the transaction of personal business is granted without charge to an employee's vacation time. Therefore, any system adopted for Federal use must not only

provide for adequate vacations, but must allow a few additional days each year for incidental use.

B. Conclusions: The present allowance of annual leave which generally is at the rate of 26 days a year to permanent employees and 30 days a year to temporary employees is, in some respects, too liberal to many employees and too costly to the Government. It is difficult to justify a system under which a new employee earns the same amount of annual leave during the first year of his employment as does an old employee during his twenty-fifth or thirtieth year of service.

It is even more difficult to justify a system under which a temporary employee earns leave at a greater rate than a permanent employee. These seeming inequities can be corrected on the one hand and substantial savings accomplished on the other by adopting a system under which the amount of annual leave earned by an employee is based solely on his total length of service.¹ The type of appointment under which an employee is serving at any given time should not affect the amount of annual leave he earns; i. e., a temporary employee should not earn leave at a greater rate than a permanent employee, and a permanent employee with many years of service should not earn leave at a reduced rate in the event he accepts a temporary appointment.

The graduated system outlined on the chart attached hereto gives 13 days' annual leave a year to employees during the first few years of their service, 19½ days a year during the middle years of their service, and 26 days a year during the remaining years of their career. This is sufficient to permit a full two weeks' annual vacation plus three days for incidental purposes to employees in the first category; a full three weeks' annual vacation plus 4½ days for incidental purposes to employees in the middle category; and a full four weeks' annual vacation plus 6 days for incidental purposes to employees in the latter category.

PART IV. REDUCTION IN BACKLOG OF ACCUMULATED LEAVE

A. Generally, existing law permits an accumulation of not over 60 days annual leave. During World War II employees were permitted to accumulate not over 90 days because they could not be spared from their work. In spite of this increase in the maximum amount of accumulation, many employees lost leave at the end of each year and many employees who have reached their maximum accumulation still lose leave each year. The accumulation of annual leave is a two-sided question. On the one hand, many employees by design accumulate leave because of its insurance value during times of prolonged illness, or unemployment and its cash value upon voluntary separation from the service. On the other hand, many employees would like to use leave for vacation purposes, but are prevented from doing so because of work requirements. In either case, the Government pays an extremely high premium on account of accumulated leave, for these reasons:

1. Leave is often accumulated by an employee while he is in a low grade and is paid for at a time when he has risen to a higher grade.

2. When general pay raises (of which there have been several during recent years) go into effect, it increases the value of accumulated leave, and must be liquidated at the increased value.

B. Conclusion: Employees should be required to liquidate excessive current accu-

¹ In computing an employee's total length of service, military service and all Federal employment creditable for retirement purposes should count. In other words, the same formula should be used for leave purposes as applies in the case of retirement.

mulations of annual leave to their credit over a 5-year period at the rate of not less than 20 percent each year. To accomplish this, an employee should be required to use such leave, but if it is administratively determined that it would be detrimental to the Government service for him to be spared, then he should be paid for his leave in cash. So long as the rate of reduction is in keeping with 20 percent per year, in the event the employee leaves the service before the full 5-year period, he should be compensated for the unliquidated amount of leave still to his credit.

PART V. FUTURE ACCUMULATION OF ANNUAL LEAVE

A. Assuming that some type of unemployment insurance will be adopted and that the limitation on the amount of sick leave that may be accumulated will be removed, some positive means of controlling future accumulations of annual leave should be adopted.

B. Conclusion: The accumulations of large amounts of annual leave should not be permitted in the future. The law should be specific that annual leave is for the purpose of providing employees with time for adequate vacations and the transaction of personal affairs. Furthermore, the law should be equally specific that in the event an agency denies an employee the use of leave for these purposes, it should be required to pay the employee for the leave at the end of the fiscal year. There should be sufficient elasticity in the requirements of law to permit an employee to carry over from one year to another an amount of leave not exceeding that which he has earned during the past year in order that he may either take a prolonged vacation or otherwise juggle his vacation schedule. This privilege should not, however, obligate the Government to compensate him for such carry-over leave in the event he does not use it in this manner.

PART VI. SICK LEAVE

A. Benefits: In general, employees earn sick leave at the rate of 1¼ days a month for a total of 15 days per calendar year. Employees may accumulate sick leave in an amount not to exceed 90 days at the end of any calendar month. In addition an advance of sick leave of not to exceed 30 days may be made to an employee. In most instances advanced sick leave is amortized out of future earnings; however, if because of death, continued illness, or involuntary separation from duty, the advance is not fully liquidated out of future earnings the unliquidated balance is canceled.

B. Rate of usage: The average amount of sick leave used by Federal employees ranges from 7 to 9 days per year. Many employees use little or no sick leave year after year. The great majority use only a normal amount. A relatively few, however, use sick leave as rapidly as it accrues to their credit. There is some indication that a very limited number of employees enjoy good health until they approach or reach the maximum 90-day limit on accumulation, after which time they are ill often enough to prevent the loss of any sick leave. It is to the credit of the Federal service as a whole, however, that for each employee who plans his illnesses so as not to lose sick leave, there are a hundred who guard their health so as not to lose time from their work.

C. Conclusion: In the light of the average rate of usage, 15 days sick leave a year is too liberal. To allow an amount above that actually required by the majority takes the form of a bonus to the very small minority who abuse the use of sick leave. By and large, these few are the very ones least deserving of any reward. Accordingly, consideration should be given to reducing the amount of sick leave to not more than 13

days a year. (One-half day per biweekly pay period.)

At the same time the 90-day limitation on the amount of sick leave that can be accumulated should be removed. When an employee approaches or has reached the 90-day accumulation, the 15 days sick leave theoretically earned by him each year has little or no value. Human nature being what it is, things of little value are treated lightly, and accordingly, the indiscriminate use of sick leave may follow. If on the other hand, there were no limit on the amount of sick leave that an employee could accumulate, there would be more of an inclination to preserve it more carefully as insurance against prolonged illness in the years to come. In the final analysis, if an employee preserves his sick leave for the entire duration of his Federal service, it represents a saving of that much time to the Government and the potential liability is wiped out when the employee leaves the service. The law should impose a greater obligation on supervision to see that sick leave is used properly. At the same time, supervision should have the right to penalize employees for the abuse of sick leave. Supervision should have the authority to suspend employees for limited periods for flagrant abuse of sick leave.

PART VII. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

A. Bookkeeping aspects: Both the annual and sick-leave laws impose a needlessly complex and costly bookkeeping burden on the agencies.

1. Annual leave: The annual-leave law provides that employees shall earn and be credited with annual leave on a calendar-year basis. The Federal-wide payroll procedure is based on 26 biweekly pay periods a year with a twenty-seventh pay period each sixth or seventh year. Accordingly, the 26 biweekly pay periods never correspond precisely with any given calendar year.

Therefore, in order to maintain leave accounts in accordance with the law and also so they will be suitable for payroll purposes, it is necessary to make an adjustment in each individual account at the beginning and again at the end of each calendar year. Such adjustments cover 1 to less than 10 days' work (10 days constitute a biweekly pay period), and in terms of leave may amount to a charge or credit of only an hour or so. The total cost of making such adjustments for all employees on the rolls is well in excess of the total value of the leave for the relatively few employees who enter or leave the service during the period involved.

The annual leave law provides, further, that employees shall not have an accumulation in excess of a specified number of days at the end of any calendar year. To comply with this requirement of law, individual leave accounts are brought into balance at the end of each calendar year, instead of at the end of the fiscal year as are the other fiscal accounts of the agency. This conflict in the keeping of accounts is not only costly from an administrative standpoint, but it is one reason why the problem of funds for the payment of terminal leave arises with such frequency.

2. Sick leave: The sick-leave law provides that employees shall earn and be credited with sick leave on a calendar-month basis. The law provides, further, that employees shall not have an accumulation in excess of a specified number of days at the end of any calendar month. To comply with this requirement of law, it is necessary to post and balance the sick-leave portion of each employee account on a calendar-month basis. Accordingly, the handling of sick leave does not coincide with the handling of annual leave, and neither coincides with the handling of the other accounts of an agency.

Conclusion: Credits of both annual and sick leave should be in terms of allowances per biweekly pay period. Maximum accumulations, if any, should be applied either on a biweekly pay-period basis or at the close of the fiscal year.

B. Leave credits: Under existing law when an employee enters on duty or leaves the service, fractional parts of a month in the case of sick leave and fractional parts of incomplete biweekly pay periods in the case of annual leave are considered for the purpose of crediting earned leave or deducting unearned leave. This is a rather complicated procedure and more than a little costly.

C. Conclusion: Periods of less than a complete biweekly pay period should be disregarded for purposes of computing earned leave. The loss to an individual by not counting odd days in computing leave at the time of his entrance on duty and again at the time of his leaving the service is only a matter of hours and of little consequence. The saving in overhead on a Federal-wide basis is worth capturing.

PART VIII. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

A. Federal employees generally are not now covered by unemployment insurance. For this reason, there has been a tendency on the part of many employees to accumulate annual leave as a form of insurance against abrupt separation or long periods of illness. If the limitation on the amount of sick leave that can be accumulated is removed, and Federal employees are accorded the benefits of some type of unemployment insurance, the two principal reasons for accumulation of annual leave will have been removed.

B. Conclusion: Consideration should be given to covering Federal employees under unemployment insurance.

Comparison of present¹ system of annual leave and a graduated system based on length of service for the 1,258,070 full-time employees for whom length of service was reported²

Years of service	Number of employees	Days leave		Aggregate days leave		Aggregate value		Aggregate difference		Percent reduction	
		Present system	Graduated system	Present system	Graduated system	Present system	Graduated system	Days	Value	Days	Value
Less than 5.....	320,825	26	13	8,341,450	4,170,725	\$36,106,400	\$48,653,200	4,170,725	\$48,653,200	50	50
Over 5 and less than 15.....	770,349	26	19½	20,029,074	15,021,805	271,817,000	202,862,750	5,007,269	67,954,250	25	25
15 and over.....	166,896	26	26	4,339,296	4,339,296	73,907,600	73,907,600				
Total.....	1,258,070			32,709,820	23,531,826	441,831,000	325,823,550	9,177,994	116,007,450	28	26

¹ Present system: Present system as used here refers to the Uniform Annual Leave Act of 1936, as amended. Approximately 75 percent of all Federal employees are subject to this act. Major groups under other leave systems are—field employees of the Post Office Department; Foreign Service, Department of State; medical employees, Veterans' Administration; and commissioned officers of the Public Health Service.

² Employees for whom length of service was reported: Length of service data was obtained on 1,258,070 employees. Employees for whom length of service data was not obtained included 360,700 in the field service of the Post Office Department, 192,100 part-time employees, and 147,000 outside the continental United States. See table 5, p. 23, (committee print), Joint Report of the Bureau of the Budget and the United States Civil Service Commission.

BASIS FOR GRADUATED SYSTEM

1. Less than 5-year category: 13 days' annual leave a year for employees with less than 5 years of service compares favorably with leave practices in private industry. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 2 full weeks a year with 3 days additional for incidental use.

2. The over 5- and less than 15-year category: 19½ days' annual leave a year for employees with over 5 and less than 15 years of service follows the more liberal trend in private industry of granting increased leave to employees with more years of service. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 3 full weeks a year with 4½ days additional for incidental use.

3. The 15-year and over category: 26 days' annual leave a year to employees with 15 years or more of service recognizes length of service and the advancing age of the employees. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 4 full weeks a year or a winter and summer vacation of 2 weeks each, plus 6 days' additional for incidental use.

ANALYSIS OF GRADUATED SYSTEM

1. Annual savings: The graduated system would produce during the first year of operation a saving of 9,177,994 days of annual leave, with a value of \$116,007,450 for the 1,258,070 employees covered by the survey. This would be a saving of 28 percent in the amount of annual leave and 26 percent in the total dollar value of the leave earned by these employees. On a projected basis to cover an additional 348,300 employees (exclusive of 350,700 employees in the field service of the Post Office Department) in the Federal service at the time of the survey and an additional 500,000 who have been added since that date the total saving would be approximately 18,000,000 days of annual leave with a value of close to \$200,000,000.

2. Increased man-years: This total saving in annual leave is equal to 69,000 man-years. In terms of new employees required by the emergency, it would be necessary to employ 19 persons under the graduated system to obtain the same number of workdays as would result from 20 persons employed under the present leave system. Worded another way the manpower requirements (in production work at least) could be reduced by 5 percent.

3. Emergency and new employees: New employees entering the service either as replacements or as additional staff during the emergency or because of an increase in the Federal service for any other reason would earn during the first 5 years of their employment 13 days less per year under the graduated system than under the present system. During the next 10 years of their employment, the saving would amount to 6½ days per year. After 15 years of service there would be no further saving.

4. Net effect on career employees: A person who enters the service under the present system and is employed for 30 years earns 780 days annual leave. Under the graduated system, such an employee would earn 650 days. This reduction of 130 days is equal to 25 percent. However, fewer than half of all employees who enter the Federal service remain in the service for as long as 10 years, so the total net reduction would be greater than 25 percent.

5. Administrative aspects: The 13-, 19½-, and 26-day allowances are on a graduated basis at the rate of 4, 6, and 8 hours per biweekly pay period, respectively.

Comparison of present system¹ of annual leave and a graduated system based on length of service for the 1,258,070 full-time employees for whom length of service was reported²

Years of service	Number of employees	Days leave		Aggregate days' leave		Aggregate value		Aggregate difference		Percent reduction	
		Present system	Graduated system	Present system	Graduated system	Present system	Graduated system	Days	Value	Days	Value
Less than 5	320,825	26	13	8,341,450	4,170,725	\$96,106,400	\$48,053,200	4,170,725	\$48,053,200	50	50
Over 5 and less than 20	854,933	26	19½	22,228,258	16,671,193	309,202,400	231,901,800	5,557,055	77,300,600	25	25
20 and over	82,312	26	26	2,140,112	2,140,112	36,522,200	36,522,200				
Total	1,258,070			32,709,820	22,982,030	441,831,000	316,477,200	9,727,790	125,353,800	30	28

¹ Present system: Present system as used here refers to the Uniform Annual Leave Act of 1936, as amended. Approximately 75 percent of all Federal employees are subject to this act. Major groups under other leave systems are—field employees of the Post Office Department; Foreign Service, Department of State; medical employees, Veterans' Administration; and commissioned officers of the Public Health Service.

² Employees for whom length of service was reported: Length of service data was obtained on 1,258,070 employees. Employees for whom length of service data was not obtained included 360,700 in the field service of the Post Office Department, 192,100 part-time employees and 147,000 outside the continental United States. See table 5, p. 23 (committee print), Joint Report of the Bureau of the Budget and the United States Civil Service Commission.

BASIS FOR GRADUATED SYSTEM

1. Less than 5-year category: 13 days' annual leave a year for employees with less than 5 years of service compares favorably with leave practices in private industry. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 2 full weeks a year with 3 days additional for incidental use.
2. The over 5 and less than 20-year category: 19½ days' annual leave a year for employees with over 5 and less than 20 years of service follows the more liberal trend in private industry of granting increased leave to employees with more years of service. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 3 full weeks a year with 4½ days additional for incidental use.
3. The 20-year and over category: 26 days' annual leave a year to employees with 20 years or more of service recognizes length of service and the advancing age of the employee. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 4 full weeks a year or a winter and summer vacation of 2 weeks each, plus 6 days additional for incidental use.

ANALYSIS OF GRADUATED SYSTEM

1. Annual savings: The graduated system would produce during the first year of operation a saving of 9,727,790 days of annual leave, with a value of \$125,353,800 for the 1,258,070 employees covered by the survey. This would be a saving of 30 percent in the amount of annual leave and 28 percent in the total dollar value of the leave earned by these employees. On a projected basis to cover an additional 348,300 employees (exclusive of 360,700 employees in the field service of the Post Office Department) in the Federal service at the time of the survey and an additional 500,000 who have been added since that date it is estimated that the total saving would approximate 19,000,000 days of annual leave, with a value of over \$200,000,000.

2. Increased man-years: This total saving in annual leave is equal to 73,000 man-years. In terms of new employees required by the emergency, it would be necessary to employ slightly less than 19 persons under the graduated system to obtain the same number of workdays as would result from 20 persons employed under the present system. Worked another way the manpower requirements (in production work at least) could be reduced by more than 5 percent.

3. Emergency and new employees: New employees entering the service either as replacements or as additional staff during the emergency or because of an increase in the Federal service for any other reason would earn during the first 5 years of their employment 13 days less per year under the graduated system than under the present system. During the next 15 years of their employment, the saving would amount to 6½ days per year. After 20 years of service there would be no further saving.

4. Net effect on career employees: A person who enters the service under the present system and is employed for 30 years earns 780 days' annual leave. Under the graduated system, such an employee would earn 617 days. This reduction of 163 days is equal to 30 percent. However, fewer, than half of all employees who enter the Federal service remain for as long as 10 years, so the total net reduction would be greater than 30 percent.

5. Administrative aspects: The 13-, 19½-, and 26-day allowances are on a graduated basis at the rate of 4, 6, and 8 hours per biweekly pay period, respectively.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the present amendment would save \$250,000,000 of which is approximately the same sum my original proposal would save. It would be graduated according to length of service, thus conforming more closely to the practice in private enterprise.

I read from a letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], dated June 11, 1951, from Mr. James M. Mitchell of the United States Civil Service Commission:

While the Commission is not making a recommendation at this time to reduce the leave of Federal employees, it is believed that any change in the leave system should contemplate a graduated scale whereby the amount of annual leave granted employees would be related directly to the employees' length of service. In the Commission's opinion, a graduated system would also be more equitable to career employees.

Mr. President, I think the last logical excuse for not taking action has now been removed. We have to fish or cut bait. There has been stalling for over a year on the part of the Civil Service Commission, and there may have been a little bit of delay in the Senate; I am not certain about that. But we now have a chance to act.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to my genial friend, the very able dialectician from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. On a point of personal privilege, I hope the word means what I think it does.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It means one who is very skilled in argument.

Mr. KERR. I was hoping it had a wholesome meaning, but I wanted to be clear on that point. I thank the Senator.

With reference to my question, does the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois eliminate the liability of the Government in the future to pay the employees to whom the amendment applies for accumulated leave?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator did not follow the very interesting discussion of the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Michigan pointed out that in the appropriation bill for independent offices, there is a provision that accumulated leave cannot be taken in the future, and that instead an employee must take all the leave granted in a particular year. This amendment prohibits the payment in this year of more than the sums indicated, and the amendment of the section in the independent offices bill prohibits the accumulation of claims in the future, so that the gate is completely locked if the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma was not aware of the fact that the amendment discussed by the Senator from Michigan had become law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is well known that it is about to become law.

Mr. KERR. I should like to renew the question and ask the Senator if the adoption of his amendment would eliminate the liability of the Government to the employee whom the Senator's amendment would prevent being paid.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The effect of the two amendments would be just that.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator answer the question with reference to his own amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is not a lawyer, and he is reluctant to commit himself on a legal question.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator like to be informed with reference to the matter?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oklahoma a member of the Supreme Court?

Mr. KERR. No; and he does not need to be to know that the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would not limit the liability of the Government to the employee, and the Senator from Oklahoma has enough respect for the law to cause him not to vote for a futile and a foolish thing.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. With regard to the point raised by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I think the Senator overlooked a vital matter in connection with the independent offices bill. Without suspending the rules, it would accomplish exactly what the Senator from Illinois seeks to accomplish.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays, and yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the subject matter which I had intended to discuss has already been covered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I do not think there is any question that a limitation upon an appropriation bill with regard to the ex-

penditure of money does not change the law, and we would be doing a futile thing by adopting the amendment. There is no question in my mind, and I do not think there should be any question in the mind of anyone else, that if a man who had served his country in the employ of our Government were sick for a longer period than that specified in this limitation on the appropriation, later on another Congress would appropriate the money.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I want to state that it is unfair for us to try at the last moment to change the law by limiting the expenditure of money. The procedure relating to sick leave and annual leave of employees of the Government of the United States has been established after careful study. This proposal is much more important than is any limitation upon annual leave. When we are dealing with the service of an individual, I do not think the Senate should vote for a limitation such as this without giving the employee an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Government employee does not have to be heard. It is basic law. It is a legal obligation, and, even more, it is a moral obligation.

Mr. McFARLAND. I concede that what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico says is correct, but it might deprive the employee of being paid what was due him at a time when he needed the money for the support of his family more than at any other period in his life.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That applies to the merits of the case; but the basic consideration is that we should not go through the back door to violate the law.

Mr. McFARLAND. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the law is not correct, let us amend it. The Kefauver committee has been investigating crime, and I say that any time we go around by the back way to avoid the law we are contributing to crime.

Mr. McFARLAND. And we are failing to fulfill our obligations.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not at all satisfied that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois reduces the liability of the Government any more than the original amendment proposed by him. But quite aside from that, although I know it is quite within the rules of the Senate, I think it is a great pity that an amendment so important as this, which proposes to change the entire system of leaves, both for vacations and sick leave, should be presented without giving Senators any opportunity whatsoever to study it and know what is in the amendment.

I do not know what is in the amendment, even though it was read. It was hastily read by the clerk. I doubt whether many Senators on the floor know exactly what is proposed to be done by it. And certainly if Senators have listened carefully to the reading of the amendment, and heard it clearly,

they have had no opportunity for giving consideration to the effect of the proposed change, a change which will overturn a system which has been in effect in the Government for many years. I say that without passing on the merits of the proposal. But I do not think it is right to submit an amendment, so wide-flung in its implications and in its results, without giving the Members of the Senate an opportunity of knowing what they are considering and are to vote on.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that it is not a simple matter with which we are dealing. It is a matter which goes deeply and profoundly into the hearts and minds of all Government workers. Hearings are given on bills which come to the Senate, in accordance with the custom in the Senate, but by this amendment it is proposed to legislate on the floor without giving the committee a chance to act upon the subject.

What would we be doing thereby? Legal minds of the Senate differ as to just what would be the effect of the amendment. Should we legislate on something about which we are in doubt? The only thing I would ask is that the committee be given time to look into this particular question, and then act upon it as we do on other matters that come before the committee. If that is done, I shall be satisfied to vote on the matter when it is reported to the Senate. Let Senators amend the bill to suit their individual tastes on the floor of the Senate, but I plead with Senators not to do something hurriedly which they might regret later.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, one of the things I have come to respect most as a Member of the Senate is the work of its committees. It has been my privilege to serve on three of the great committees of the Senate. It has been my privilege to observe them in their work.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from South Carolina on his remark that legal minds of the Senate differ as to what is in the amendment. Prior to his having made that statement I hesitated to acknowledge that the amendment was not entirely clear to me. I hope I have a legal mind. I hope I have the average mind of a Senator who has had the limited service I have had. But I doubt if more than a few Members of the Senate know as much about everything that every committee of the Senate does as some of the Senators seem to know. There may come a time, Mr. President, when I will feel that I am competent, without a hearing, and without a study, to vote on legislative matters on the floor of the Senate which either have not been heard or have not been acted on by a committee, or which are in the process of being heard or acted on by a committee, but before the committee has had the time or the opportunity or seen fit to bring them to the floor for consideration and action by the Senate.

To me, Mr. President, it is unthinkable that two of the great committees of the Senate should be treated in the manner

which the adoption of this amendment would evidence, especially in view of the fact that there is no legal mind on the floor of the Senate, or out of it, that will say that this amendment is anything but futile. It effects no saving to the United States Government. It goes through the motion of saying that employees who are on sick leave beyond a certain period of time shall be denied their pay, if I understand any part of it, but at the same time leaves the Government in the position of being legally indebted to the employee. I do not say that that is an end which should not be attained, Mr. President, but if it is a worthy end, and if it is worthy of our support, it is worthy of being brought in by the front door and not by the back door.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I do not wish unduly to prolong the debate, and it is rare indeed that I have joined with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] or the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]; but I wonder how those who serve as members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee feel when they are told by this amendment that they do not have the ability, the honesty, or the integrity to do their job for their country and for the Federal employees. I do not like it at all, and I am sure that other Senators who serve on the committee do not. When they see an amendment offered which is conceived in error and urged upon us as a slanderous attack upon the great Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] when he promises that he is going to do his duty, and all the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee have promised that they would do their duty respecting this matter.

I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma. I am a country lawyer, and I do not know what the amendment means. I am not one to shoot in the dark.

Mr. President, I say it is about time that we call a halt to all this acting here; that we vote down the amendment, and leave it to the senior Senator from South Carolina and his committee to do what is right in the premises. I am sure we want to do what is necessary. If we adopt an amendment such as this, what is the use of the committee debating the postal rate bill, spending hours of time, day after day, on it? I say it is time to call a halt to such proposals. We should either abandon the committee functions entirely, or go about our work in an orderly way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise for a moment to object to some of the insinuations which have been made here this afternoon as to the purposes, objectives, and intent of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The senior Senator from Illinois has made a consistent and determined effort to bring about economy in Government. I have differed with him on many occasions. In fact, I have differed with respect to the majority of the amendments which he has presented to the Senate in an effort to promote the kind

of economy he desires. But be that as it may, Mr. President, no Member of this body is more sincere, a finer citizen, or a finer Senator than my friend the senior Senator from Illinois. I have not supported his proposals, but I deeply resent any insinuation as to his purposes, his motives, his convictions, or his ability.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator hear the senior Senator from Illinois intimate or say that we should have a vote on this question and find out about the sincerity of Members of this body?

Mr. HUMPHREY. My only reply to the Senator from Oklahoma is that I believe that if we had less wrangling here, and less insinuation as to motives of Senators, we would accomplish much more in attaining the purposes of legislation.

I know the senior Senator from Illinois as a friend, as does the Senator from Oklahoma. He knows that he is an able fighter, a great debater, with a keen mind and a sense of deep sincerity. All I am saying is that I propose that the Senate vote on this amendment on the basis of its merits as we see them, without in any way impugning the motives of any Senator who proposes an amendment on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Then the Senator from Minnesota recognizes the fact, does he not, that a Senator may vote against this amendment and still be just as sincere as its author when he votes for it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that Senators who vote against this amendment will do so simply because of what the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has said, that he has the right, as chairman of the committee, to have legislative measures referred to his committee. I think that is a rather sound position. But be that as it may, I still say that no Member of this body has given more careful examination or detailed analysis to the budget than has the Senator from Illinois. As a friend and colleague, I rise to support his honorable intentions and purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, suppose Senators forget about hurt sensibilities for the moment, and let us get down to a vote on this amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have said nothing with respect to several of the amendments. I have been compelled to vote against two of them because it seemed to me that the savings were insignificant. I am profoundly favorable to real economy, but I cannot escape the conclusion that we do our cause an injustice and weaken it before the American people, by insisting upon amendments which really accomplish very little when all is said and done, assuming the utmost good faith in offering them and the highest purpose in presenting them to the Senate.

There are appropriation bills coming up in connection with which there could be substantial cuts. If the Senate is

then willing really to effect economies, we can get somewhere with a program which will at least lead us back toward a sound financial and fiscal system. There must be cuts in the appropriations ahead of us, some of which will be represented by the highest brass in the country, but I shall not hesitate to vote against them, because I am confident that they are asking for more money than they can wisely or intelligently spend.

There is to be a big appropriation asked, totaling almost \$10,000,000,000, for foreign aid and assistance. The acid test of whether we mean to bring about any economy in Government will come upon such big appropriations, as a result of which large amounts of money are being spent. In the judgment of sound, thinking men and women in this country, we shall accomplish little except to discredit a good cause by cutting off a little here, proposing a little cut there, and making other minor reductions.

With all respect to the Chair—and I have every respect for the Chair—I am satisfied in my own mind that this amendment is clearly and unmistakably subject to a point of order. It is not a question of limining an appropriation. It is not a question of denying an appropriation for something which the Congress has itself authorized by law. This amendment proposes payment of leave pay on a basis vitally, definitely, and radically different from anything written in the law. It is a change of law. It is a change of law for this year, but it is a change of law. This amendment does propose legislation on an appropriation bill.

It would be competent for the Congress to say that there shall be no appropriation made to pay those in the departments who take leave of absence this year, or to say that we will pay for only 50 percent of it. But that is not what this amendment does. This amendment provides that those who have served for 5 years shall receive so much; that those who have served a longer time shall receive more; and that those who have served for the maximum period stated in the amendment shall receive the full amount fixed by the law.

That is a change of basic law in an appropriation act. It can be nothing else. For that reason alone I would vote against it, because I do not believe in general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I hope there may be some legislation presented by the committee having jurisdiction of this subject. I refer to the committee presided over by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I have every faith that that committee will bring forth some legislative proposals which will enable us to vote an honest conviction, and not vote against a strong and abiding conviction when we are presented with legislation upon an appropriation bill.

I realize the condition in which our country finds itself. I know cuts must be made in appropriations. It will not suffice to raise ten, fifteen, or twenty billion dollars more in Federal revenues through taxation. Regardless of what

is raised by taxation, there will still be left a potential deficit at the end of 1952, unless we also reduce expenditures by at least \$6,000,000,000. We ought to bring to bear the very best common sense possible in this most important juncture of our national and international affairs.

In my opinion, we are proceeding upon a general theory which is suicidal. It is the theory of allocating all of our raw materials and vital materials to the Military Establishment, at a time when the country is in the grasp of a military economy. What does it mean? It means the crucifixion of many small businesses; It means the crucifixion of many tax-fabricators of farm implements and tools. It means the crucifixion of many taxpayers. It means the reduction of the Federal income itself, because of the crucifixion of the taxpayers out of whose pockets the money must come.

All the restrictions which the Committee on Banking and Currency and my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] can put upon prices of articles and upon wages and credit will not furnish the answer, if there is not a sensible allocation made as between military and civilian demands.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that, as he knows, he and I have discussed the situation on many occasions, particularly recently. I can only see the same picture that he sees. If to the military are allocated all the steel, all the copper, and all the aluminum, and private business firms throughout the country must curtail their production, there will be less and less money raised by taxation. Two and two make four.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia has referred to farm-machinery production being cut back, to allocations for railroad cars, and to big factories in Michigan having to materially cut back production. I am in thorough agreement with what he has said. I only hope that we can arrive at some solution before the Defense Production Act expires on June 30. I am of the opinion that we must have some sort of controls. I believe we have a good act. I will say further that the administration of the act has been pretty poor. To my way of thinking it has been pretty bad. The fault lies with its administration.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I am certain that he is correct. There must be controls, but controls alone are not the answer. There must be higher taxes, but higher taxes alone are not the answer. There must be cuts in the expenditures by the Government if we are to put our feet on the road that leads back to sound fiscal and financial policies. Not only is what the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has said true, to wit, that the allocations to which he referred would cut into our revenues, but would add an irrepressible force to inflation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Unemployment, too.

Mr. GEORGE. And unemployment. That would be the case regardless of controls. Shall we not approach the problem correctly?

I have every respect and confidence in the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I believe he means to bring about real economy in our spending, and with that I am in fullest sympathy. However, I cannot help repeating that it is a great mistake to fire a 14-inch shell at a little sparrow, even though it is desirable to kill the sparrow and even though a small amount of economy is effected thereby. I believe we would bring discredit upon our efforts in the great job ahead, and the great job ahead clearly indicates that we can effect certain economies in the ordinary supply bills.

However, if there is to be a \$6,000,000,000 saving in our spending, it must be made somewhere along the line. The Military Establishment will have to make savings. It is absolutely vital to the salvation of this Nation. As yet we are not in a world war. As yet we are fighting a minor war in a limited area of the world. If we are to fight that war as it should be fought, and if we are to make real cuts in appropriations as we should make them, we must make certain that our civilian economy will not be allowed to die, at a time when it is so vital and necessary to have the money coming into the Treasury, and when it is so vitally necessary to conserve manpower and prevent inflation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we make a mistake. I rose for the purpose of saying that we should not override one of the standing committees of this body. It is a committee which has been trying to meet its fullest obligation. We should not override the committee by a species of legislation on an appropriation bill. I recognize the soundness of limiting appropriations. However, when a limitation also becomes legislation, it goes beyond the rules that should be followed in this body.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois on page 41, line 24.

Mr. DOUGLAS and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference now being held in Geneva, Switzerland. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—14

Brewster	Jenner	Taft
Butler, Nebr.	Long	Wherry
Byrd	Nixon	Wiley
Douglas	Smith, Maine	Williams
Ferguson	Smith, N. J.	

NAYS—56

Aiken	Humphrey	Monroney
Anderson	Hunt	Moody
Bennett	Ives	Morse
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Carlson	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kefauver	Pastore
Clements	Kerr	Russell
Dworshak	Kilgore	Schoepel
Eaton	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Langer	Sparkman
George	Lehman	Stennis
Green	Magnuson	Thye
Hayden	Maybank	Tobey
Hendrickson	McCarran	Underwood
Hennings	McCarthy	Watkins
Hill	McClellan	Welker
Hoey	McFarland	Young
Holland	McKellar	

NOT VOTING—26

Benton	Eastland	Martin
Bricker	Flanders	McMahon
Cain	Frear	Millikin
Capehart	Fulbright	Murray
Case	Gillette	O'Connor
Connally	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Saltonstall
Dirksen	Lodge	Smathers
Duff	Malone	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I move that the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions promptly to report the bill to the Senate in the form in which it was recommitted, except with such changes as may be necessary to make the sums available for expenditure by or for the National Cancer Institute, mental health activities, tuberculosis services, venereal disease services, dental health activities, National Heart Institute, National Institutes of Health, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Children's Bureau identical with the respective amounts contained in the bill when it was first reported by the committee to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HOEY. Vote!

(Mr. NEELY addressed the Senate. After having spoken, for a few minutes, without completing his speech, he yielded to Mr. McFARLAND to propose a unanimous-consent agreement. Mr. NEELY's speech will be published hereafter entire after it shall have been concluded.)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield for a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was not trying to get the distinguished Senator to stop his speech. I heartily agree that the things being referred to by the Senator should be done, but I do not know that it would do any good to recommit the bill. What I wanted to ask the Senator was whether he expected to finish his speech tonight or whether he wanted to continue tomorrow and have the bill go over.

Mr. NEELY. I would much rather have it go over until tomorrow, if that is agreeable.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator expect that he will take quite a little time?

Mr. NEELY. I shall take some time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course, I want the Senator from West Virginia to have all the time he actually wants and needs, in order that he may properly and adequately make his views known to the Senate. But we have been considering the pending bill for 5 or 6 days. I know the time has not been taken by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Only 10 lines of debate in the RECORD.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Could we not come to some agreement? The only thing which is in order now is the motion of the Senator from West Virginia. The bill has been read the third time, so nothing else can come up except his motion, or a motion of a similar nature. Can we agree, if we go over until

tomorrow, to have a vote on the bill at some particular time?

Mr. NEELY. If I may be given 1 hour in which to discuss the motion made by me, I shall be glad to agree on any time for a vote which will be satisfactory to the other Members of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that he shall not thereby lose the floor?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia shall have the floor for the purpose of discussing his motion—for a period of how long?

Mr. NEELY. Not more than 1 hour.

Mr. McFARLAND. For a period of not more than 1 hour, and that the opponents of the motion shall have not more than 1 hour.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May we not have a definite hour fixed at which to vote?

Mr. McFARLAND. In order to obtain an agreement fixing a time for the vote, it would be necessary, under the rules, to have a quorum call.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What about 2 o'clock?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall restate my unanimous-consent request. I do not want to have a quorum call. I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate convenes tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia shall have the floor, and that he be limited to 1 hour in which to discuss his motion to recommit; that the time of the opposition to the motion be limited to 30 minutes, and that the time on the bill be limited—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like 15 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. That the time on the bill be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. WHERRY. That would bring us to 2 o'clock, would it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. That would be approximately 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. It would mean that there would be a vote at 2 o'clock. Then, if agreeable, will the Senator include a provision that we have a vote on the bill at 2 o'clock?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We must first vote on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And then, after that, we must vote on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Make it "not later than 2 o'clock."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order to accommodate everyone, I ask unanimous consent that the rule requiring a quorum call in this connection be waived, and that the time for voting upon the pending motion and for voting upon the bill be fixed at not later than 2 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY rose.

Mr. NEELY. And that I be given the time indicated?

Mr. McFARLAND. And that the time of the Senator from West Virginia be

limited to an hour. He will have the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I call attention to the fact that as the unanimous-consent request is made, it would seem to limit the debate in favor of the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to the Senator from West Virginia alone. It is possible that some other Senator may wish to take the floor in support of the motion of the Senator from West Virginia, and I think the unanimous-consent request should be so stated as to permit such additional remarks. The Senator from West Virginia has requested an hour, so that the unanimous-consent request now allots him the 1 hour, and then allots 1 hour to the opposition, in any way that it may be divided.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me ask the Senator from West Virginia whether he would be willing to limit the time for speaking in favor of the motion to 1 hour, the time to be controlled by himself?

Mr. NEELY. No. Mr. President, I hope that that suggestion will not be insisted upon. Some of the ablest "hatchet men" in the Senate have been working against this appropriation bill for almost the past 2 weeks. I think that there ought to be an opportunity to discuss the bill as I may desire, and no one yet has talked right out in meeting about what the result of passing the bill in its present form would be. I want to make the explanation so specific that the wayfaring man can understand what we are doing to the victims of cancer. I want it understood what we are doing to the victims of heart disease and mental diseases. I want it understood what we are doing to all the various classes of people from whom we are withholding the services of which they would be deprived by virtue of adopting the Ferguson amendment and other amendments of similar nature.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am going to restate my first unanimous consent request, and, if it is objected to, then we simply shall have no unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say there are probably three or four of us who have been very active in regard to some of the items contained in the bill, and who, because of the legislative and parliamentary situation have not had a chance to express ourselves fully. I remember in my own case that I merely had to say, "I associate myself with the remarks of the Senators from New York and Alabama." We might desire to say something on the Neely motion. It would not take long in my own case, nor, I am sure, in the case of most of us—possibly 5 or 10 minutes. So I am hoping that the unanimous-consent request will include the 1 hour which the Senator from West Virginia wants, and also provide a certain leeway in regard to time in order that we may be heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. How much time does the Senator want?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said, in my own case, I would need but 5 or 6 minutes, possibly, but, in any event, not more than 10.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would be willing to let Senators who intend to speak along the lines suggested by the Senator from West Virginia have 30 minutes of my 1 hour.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow the Senator from West Virginia be given the floor, and that he have 1 hour in which to discuss his motion to recommit; that thereafter the time to discuss the motion to recommit be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to the proponents, 15 minutes to the opponents, and that the time for discussion of the bill be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to the proponents and 15 minutes to the opponents.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator make it 30 minutes?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Reserving the right to object, if the Senator from Arizona would make a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote on this question at, say, 2 or 2:15 o'clock tomorrow, I am sure that would provide ample time for all Senators, and there would be no limitation of an hour on the Senator from West Virginia, or a limitation of 3 minutes on some other Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is opposition. If we cannot get a unanimous-consent agreement we shall recess, if that is all right with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, if the Senator will make the time 30 minutes instead of 15 minutes, I believe we can agree to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall make one more attempt, and only one. I am not going to stay here all night propounding requests.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], have the floor and that the time to discuss his motion be limited to one hour; that the time thereafter be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side; that the time for discussing the bill itself be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side, the time to be divided between the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the distinguished minority leader, with reference to the bill, and that the time on the motion be divided between the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], unless he favors the motion, in which event, the time shall be divided between the Senator from West Virginia and the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator accept an amendment to the request, that I may obtain the floor immediately after the vote upon the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. I cannot add that to the request. I do not believe in farming out the time. I am trying to put a limitation on the debate, which will give the Senator from Wisconsin an opportunity to obtain the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Reserving the right to object, I am afraid that immediately after the vote on the bill tomorrow there may be a motion to recess or to adjourn over the week end.

Mr. McFARLAND. I can give the Senator assurance that I am not going to try to keep him from speaking by making a motion to recess immediately after the vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. In other words, I have the Senator's assurance that there will be no such motion made immediately after the vote on the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no intention of recessing the Senate at that time of day.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the bill has been before the Senate for at least a week. I have been in attendance most of the time. I have listened time and time again to the senior Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the subcommittee, plead for expediting action. He has pointed out that the bill involves very vital features. It is unfortunate if any Member of this body has found it impossible to be present during the debate, but if we are to take a week or more for the consideration of each of the 12 regular appropriation bills, I wonder when Congress will complete work on the schedule which has been presented to it, even as late as this morning, by the President of the United States. We have received a great deal of criticism about sabotaging the work of this body. I wonder that the senior Senator from New Mexico is willing to accept this kind of an agreement, when he has been pleading for the past week for expediting action on this bill.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have not yielded, and I refuse to yield for that kind of a speech.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator does not have to listen to it.

Mr. NEELY. I said nothing about listening to it. I said I refused to yield for that kind of a speech.

Mr. McFARLAND. May we have a decision on the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the unanimous-consent request, and I hope the Senator from Arizona will not object to it. The amendment is that immediately after the vote is taken on the bill, the junior Senator from Wisconsin may obtain the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. No, Mr. President, I cannot accept that amendment. That is farming out the time of the Senate. I gave the Senator assurance that I would try to let him have an opportunity to speak, but I am not going to as far as his amendment would go. If the Senator objects, I will withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request as stated by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if there is anything unreasonable about my request, I withdraw it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not like to agree to any Senator having the floor at any particular time. The only exception I ever made in that regard was when a Senator was speaking and other Senators wanted the Senate to recess. If the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin were speaking at this time, I would extend him the same courtesy I would extend to the Senator from West Virginia. What he requests is not according to the rules, and I am trying to treat all Senators alike.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Senator made a similar agreement with the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. McFARLAND. I did not make it.

Mr. LANGER. It is a simple request, and I think it should be granted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senate unnecessarily. If I object, I shall be able to get the floor before the vote on the measure. I think, in view of the fact that I am serving notice that I wish to speak tomorrow, and no other Senator has indicated a desire to speak it is a very reasonable amendment to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I have no objection to his obtaining the floor. It is a matter of principle. If I have to agree to such a thing it will be with reluctance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request as stated? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that the agreement has been entered into, will the Chair state what it is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator from Arizona to restate the agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. First, Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for not objecting.

The agreement is that tomorrow, when the Senate reconvenes, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] will have the floor and his time to speak on his motion to recommit the bill will be limited to 1 hour; that thereafter the time on the motion to recommit will be limited to 1 hour, to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to have charge for the time of the proponents and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to have charge of the time for the opponents, unless he favors the motion, in which event the distinguished Minority Leader shall have charge of the time for the opponents; that thereafter the debate on the bill will be 30 minutes, 15 minute to a side, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to have charge of the time for the proponents and the distinguished minority leader to have charge of the time for the opponents.

Mr. WHERRY. I am more interested in the time element than in anything else, and if I correctly understand the

interpretation of the agreement, 1 hour will be given the Senator from West Virginia, and an additional hour will be allowed to discuss the motion to recommit if Senators care to take that much time.

Mr. McFARLAND. The total time on the motion to recommit may be up to 2 hours, with the Senator from West Virginia occupying the first hour. Thereafter the additional hour, if used, will be divided between the proponents and the opponents, and the vote on the motion to recommit will take place not later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Thereafter, 30 minutes will be used, 15 minutes to a side, for what purpose?

Mr. McFARLAND. For discussion of the bill itself.

Mr. WHERRY. So that 2 hours will be available on the motion, and if they are completely used they would take until 2 o'clock. Thereafter there will be 30 minutes for discussion of the bill, 15 minutes to a side. That would make the maximum time for a vote on the bill about 2:30. Am I correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are we to vote on the motion at 2 o'clock?

Mr. McFARLAND. Not necessarily. There may be a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader, because, in the confusion, it was impossible to tell at times what was to happen at a certain hour. Several Senators are very much interested in when the vote will be taken.

Mr. President, there is one thing I should like to say. The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] told me he had a very important engagement tomorrow. It means a great deal to him and to his family. He would very much have liked to have the Senate continue tonight and finish action on the bill. I urged that he withhold his objection. I told him, however, to use his own judgment. I personally want to thank him for not objecting to the arrangement which has been entered into. It means much to him to be at the place appointed for him to be tomorrow, but, in view of the fact that he is such an industrious and loyal Senator, I suppose he will forego keeping his engagement, and remain in the Senate. If there is one Senator to whom the orchid should be given for going the last mile to help the majority leader and other Senators interested in the bill, it is the junior Senator from New Jersey, who did not object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for the statement he has made. I did have an engagement for tomorrow. I was to be given an honorary degree by my alma mater, Temple University. I was on the point of objecting to the unanimous-consent request. I have seen Senators on this floor from time to time at moments similar to this object for purely selfish reasons. So long as I am a Member of the Senate I shall refuse to

be selfish about the business of the Senate. I want to cooperate with the majority leader fully at all times. But I think that other Senators from now on should be a little less selfish about their own notions as to how the business of the Senate should be conducted at times.

I wish that statement to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for the attitude he has taken. I will say to him that I do not think any objection he would make to anything would be made for selfish purposes. I express my appreciation to him.

Now that the Senator from Wisconsin has returned, I wish to express my thanks to him also for not objecting to the unanimous-consent request. I will add the Senator from Idaho to the list, and to make it unanimous I will add all other Senators.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in case I should be absent tomorrow I now want the record to show very plainly that I am opposed to the motion to recommit; that I am wholeheartedly for the bill as it is now before the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair), laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND NAVIGATION WITH COLOMBIA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive M, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Colombia, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Washington on April 26, 1951. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy is removed from the treaty, and the treaty, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Colombia, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Washington on April 26, 1951.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the treaty

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 13, 1951.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol, signed at Washington April 26, 1951.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Wayne Coy, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1951 (reappointment); and

Franklin J. Miller, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert I. Millonzi, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 14, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Pursuant to the provision of section 4 (a) of Public Law 492, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia nominate the following-named person for appointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency:

Francis F. Healy, for the unexpired term of Edward A. Dent, resigned, which term expires from and after March 3, 1954.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

Ralph E. Knutti

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Edward G. Hampp

To be senior assistant dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Carl J. Witkop, Jr.

To be assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

James L. Field Anderson F. Williams

Weldon G. Blodgett Homer F. Stephens

Judson C. Hickey

To be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Harvey F. Ludwig

John H. Ludwig

To be junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

William T. Nakaoka Basil P. Ketcham

Edward L. Schmidt, Jr. Mario C. Baratta

To be sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Ralph L. Perkins

To be physical therapist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Eleanor G. Loomis

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be major

John F. Connole, MC, O411291.

To be captains

Maxwell D. Bentley, MC, O1755218.

William E. Froemming, MC, O466146.

Robert M. Hall, MC, O435168.

David J. LaFia, MC, O991900.

John F. Miley, MC.

Thomas G. Nelson, MC, O1736570.

Robert L. Obourn, MC, O418579.

James J. O'Donnell, MC, O1718228.

Clinton A. Piper, MC.

Spencer B. Reid, MC, O1785579.

Richard A. Rink, MC, O439904.

James E. Shipley, MC, O1756937.

To be first lieutenants

Robert I. Cochran, DC, O982922.

Harold S. Elliott, DC, O736495.

John E. Flick, JAGC, O989982.

Darwin F. Fuller, Jr., DC, O2086818.

Bueford G. Herbert, JAGC, O988322.

Frank Herbert, Jr., MSC, O1997090.

Malcolm L. McCain, JAGC, O989983.

Ernest B. Minglehoff, DC, O937405.

Harvey W. Phelps, MC, O975695.

Harry B. Philp, DC, O1185116.

James J. Proyor, Jr., DC, O981268.

Donald L. Shaneyfelt, JAGC, O549484.

Robert B. Steiner, DC, O2064995.

Hugh T. Verano, JAGC, O1118672.

John W. Whelan, JAGC, O990930.

Charles A. Zuccardy, JAGC, O529346.

82D CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. R. 3709

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 14, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Depart-
5 ment of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related
6 independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30,
7 1952, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the

1 Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title
 2 referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized
 3 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
 4 55a) ; purchase of not to exceed ~~(1)~~~~two~~ one passenger motor
 5 vehicles for replacement only; teletype news service; and
 6 payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for
 7 dues or fees for library membership in organizations
 8 whose publications are available to members only or to
 9 members at a price lower than to the general public;
 10 ~~(2)~~~~\$1,425,000~~ \$1,000,000.

11 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: For
 12 expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor,
 13 ~~(3)~~~~\$1,650,000~~ \$1,575,000.

14 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: For
 15 expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety,
 16 employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations
 17 for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of
 18 the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation
 19 Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)) ; performance of
 20 the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the
 21 Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C.
 22 159 (f) and (g)) ; and not to exceed \$75,000 for the
 23 work of the President's Committee on National Employ
 24 the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the
 25 Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including purchase

1 of reports and of material for informational exhibits; and
 2 expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants
 3 at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of
 4 Labor Standards; \$688,000 (4), of which not more than
 5 \$604,870 shall be available for personal services.

6 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemploy-
 7 ment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance
 8 in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of
 9 veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and
 10 Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308),
 11 the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army
 12 Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as
 13 amended, and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service
 14 Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C., App. 459 (h)), and, under the
 15 Act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App.
 16 1472), of persons who have performed service in the
 17 Merchant Marine, (5)\$277,000 \$265,758 (6), of which not
 18 more than \$213,603 shall be available for personal services.

19 BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

20 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable
 21 the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging appren-
 22 tice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937
 23 (29 U. S. C. 50), (7)\$2,692,000 \$2,578,682 (8), of which
 24 not more than \$2,153,049 shall be available for personal
 25 services.

1 BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
3 general administration of the employment service and un-
4 employment compensation programs, including temporary
5 employment of persons, without regard to the civil service
6 laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; for
7 cooperation with the United States Immigration and Natural-
8 ization Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and
9 carrying out agreements relating to the employment of foreign
10 agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and
11 when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force;
12 and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by
13 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C.
14 55a) ; ~~(9)\$4,635,500~~ \$5,245,959, of which ~~(10)\$743,500~~
15 \$1,513,765 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions
16 of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Read-
17 justment Act of 1944 ~~(11)~~and of which not more than
18 \$4,351,773 shall be available for personal services.

19 Grants to States for unemployment compensation and em-
20 ployment service administration: For grants in accordance
21 with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended
22 (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602
23 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants
24 to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security
25 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the

1 request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the
2 payment of rental for space made available to such State
3 in lieu of grants for such purpose, and for necessary expenses
4 in connection with the operation of employment office facil-
5 ities and services in the District of Columbia, ~~(12)\$165,-~~
6 ~~560,000~~ \$164,560,000, ~~(13)~~ of which not more than
7 \$647,037 shall be available for personal services, and
8 of which ~~(14)\$6,000,000~~ \$5,000,000 shall be available
9 only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary
10 to meet increased costs of administration resulting from
11 changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of
12 claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those
13 upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation
14 for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased
15 costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal
16 budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding
17 any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a) of
18 the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of
19 Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary
20 of the Treasury for payment to each State found to
21 be in compliance with the requirements of the Act of
22 June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico
23 and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303
24 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts
25 as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient

1 administration of its unemployment compensation law and
2 of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That
3 such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department
4 of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for
5 the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly
6 determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail
7 matter in connection with the administration of unemploy-
8 ment compensation systems and employment services by
9 States receiving grants herefrom.

10 In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6,
11 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social
12 Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment
13 and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis,
14 shall apply.

15 None of the funds appropriated by this title to the
16 Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State
17 agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation
18 of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers
19 and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the
20 said agencies of any States which have established by legis-
21 lative enactment and have in operation a merit system and
22 classification and compensation plan covering the selection,
23 tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, be-
24 cause of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner

1 of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the
2 rates of pay of said officers or employees.

3 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
4 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to
5 States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended,
6 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the
7 first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums
8 as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the
9 expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title
10 and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the
11 appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

12 BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

13 Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative
14 expenses and not to exceed \$46,000 for the Employees'
15 Compensation Board of Appeals, ~~(15)\$1,947,000~~ \$1,887,-
16 ~~816~~ (16), of which not more than \$1,618,499 shall be
17 available for personal services, together with not to exceed
18 \$122,000 to be derived from the War Claims Fund created
19 by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50
20 U. S. C. 2012).

21 Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of
22 compensation and other benefits and expenses (except
23 administrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing
24 during the current or any prior fiscal year, including pay-

1 ments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital
2 services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of
3 Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of bene-
4 fits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits"
5 in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947;
6 the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in
7 third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital
8 services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial
9 expenses, including transportation and other expenses inci-
10 dental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such
11 enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified
12 by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services
13 and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943,
14 and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian em-
15 ployees of the United States, and the limitations and author-
16 ity of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C.
17 796), shall apply in providing such services, treatment, and
18 expenses in such cases; \$30,000,000, together with not to
19 exceed \$5,000,000 to be derived from the War Claims
20 Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of
21 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and to be available for payments
22 pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of such Act, which
23 amounts may be accounted for as one fund.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~(17)\$5,243,000~~ \$5,371,352 ~~(18)~~, of which not more than \$4,530,755 shall be available for personal services.

Revision of consumers' price index: For expenses necessary to enable the Bureau to complete the revision of the Consumers' Price Index, including temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service and classification laws and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); ~~(19)\$1,000,000~~ \$1,125,000 ~~(20)~~, of which not more than \$991,323 shall be available for personal services.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of re-

1 ports and material for informational exhibits, ~~(21)\$389,000~~
 2 \$379,285 (22), of which not more than \$317,581 shall be
 3 available for personal services.

4 WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

5 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for per-
 6 forming the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards
 7 Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide condi-
 8 tions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts
 9 by the United States, approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C.
 10 38), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local
 11 agencies and their employees for inspection services ren-
 12 dered, and for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials
 13 and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of
 14 the Division, ~~(23)\$8,000,000~~ \$8,365,304 (24), of which
 15 not more than \$7,119,227 shall be available for personal
 16 services.

17 GENERAL PROVISIONS

18 SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for
 19 salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic
 20 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
 21 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for examination of esti-
 22 mates of appropriations in the field, and for expenses of
 23 attendance at meetings concerned with the function or
 24 activity for which any such appropriation is made.

25 SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appro-

1 priation in this title may be transferred to any other
 2 such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be in-
 3 creased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer:
 4 *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of
 5 new functions within the Department.

6 This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor
 7 Appropriation Act, 1952".

8 TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

9 AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

10 Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of
 11 August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$115,000.

12 COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

13 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of
 14 Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services
 15 and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements,
 16 ~~(25)\$390,000~~ \$374,537 ~~(26)~~, of which not more than
 17 \$293,805 shall be available for personal services.

18 FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

19 Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carry-
 20 ing out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as
 21 amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392, Public Law 459, approved
 22 March 16, 1950); the Tea Importation Act, as amended
 23 (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C.
 24 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C.
 25 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C.

1 61-64) ; including the purchase of not to exceed (27)seven
 2 one passenger motor vehicles, of which (28)two one shall be
 3 for replacement only; reporting and illustrating the results of
 4 investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scien-
 5 tific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment in advance
 6 for special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of
 7 fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new
 8 developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement opera-
 9 tions; (29)\$5,345,000 \$5,172,975 (30), of which not more
 10 than \$4,218,475 shall be available for personal services.

11 Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection serv-
 12 ices: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspec-
 13 tion of certain products in accordance with sections 406, 504,
 14 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug,
 15 and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 354, 356,
 16 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the advance
 17 deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payment of
 18 fees by applicants for certification or inspection of such prod-
 19 ucts, to remain available until expended. The total amount
 20 herein appropriated shall be available for personal services;
 21 purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment;
 22 and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has
 23 been rendered.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for instruction of nurses and actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university;

(31) ~~\$2,906,500~~ \$2,631,500: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title (32): *Provided further, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit*

1 *or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment*
 2 *of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of*
 3 *such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter:*
 4 *Provided further, That the Surgeon General may delegate*
 5 *the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso.*

6 HOWARD UNIVERSITY

7 Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of How-
 8 ard University, including personal services and miscella-
 9 neous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds,
 10 (33) ~~\$2,525,000~~ \$2,415,084.

11 Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans
 12 and specifications for construction, under the supervision of
 13 the General Services Administration, on the grounds of
 14 Howard University of a pharmacy building, including engi-
 15 neering and architectural services, advertising, and travel,
 16 \$55,500, to remain available until expended.

17 Construction of buildings: For construction of buildings
 18 on the grounds of Howard University, under the supervision
 19 of the General Services Administration, to remain available
 20 until expended, as follows:

21 For construction of a pharmacy building, together with
 22 alterations and installations in connection with such con-
 23 struction, including engineering and architectural services,
 24 and travel, \$904,500;

25 For payment of obligations incurred under authority

provided under this head in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, as amended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for construction of an engineering building, \$332,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), and section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30) and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462),

(34) ~~\$18,223,264~~ \$20,017,760: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed

(35) ~~\$18,048,264~~ \$19,847,760 for the current fiscal year

(36) ~~÷~~ *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 329), \$2,480,000.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library

1 service on the national level with other forms of adult
 2 education; developing library participation in Federal proj-
 3 ects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials
 4 among libraries, interstate library coordination and the devel-
 5 opment of library service throughout the country; purchase,
 6 distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-
 7 picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and
 8 cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles
 9 of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative
 10 of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education,
 11 and repairing the same; ~~(37)\$3,253,000~~ \$3,397,706, ~~(38)~~ of
 12 which not more than \$2,893,577 shall be available for per-
 13 sonal services, and of which not less than \$500,000 shall be
 14 available for the Division of Vocational Education as author-
 15 ized: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies
 16 representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of em-
 17 ployees of the Office of Education performing advisory
 18 functions to said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury
 19 of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

20 Payments to school districts: For payments to local
 21 educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of
 22 schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950
 23 (Public Law 874), ~~(39)\$28,000,000~~ \$40,000,000 ~~(40)~~:
 24 *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for
 25 carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such Act.

1 (41) Grants for school construction: For grants for emer-
 2 gency school construction to school districts in feder-
 3 ally affected areas as authorized by the Act of
 4 September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), to remain avail-
 5 able until expended, \$75,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 is
 6 for payment of obligations incurred under authority provided
 7 under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act,
 8 1951: *Provided*, That no portion of this appropriation shall
 9 be available for reimbursement payments under section 205
 10 (e) (1) of such Act with respect to school facilities com-
 11 pleted before July 1, 1951: *Provided further*, That in
 12 determining relative urgency of need for purposes of pre-
 13 scribing, under section 206 (d) of such Act, the order in
 14 which certifications for payments from this appropriation
 15 shall be made (other than payments in liquidation of con-
 16 tractual obligations incurred prior to July 1, 1951), the
 17 Commissioner shall give special consideration to the extent
 18 to which the school facilities are needed in the interests of
 19 national defense.

20 SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

21 *For providing school facilities and for grants to local*
 22 *educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized*
 23 *by title II of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law*
 24 *815), to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000, of*

1 *which \$25,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred*
 2 *under authority granted for the foregoing purpose in the*
 3 *Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.*

4 OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

5 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
 6 Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska,
 7 Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Voca-
 8 tional Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U S. C., ch. 4),
 9 including payments, in accordance with regulations of the
 10 Administrator, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the
 11 acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accord-
 12 ance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of
 13 blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be con-
 14 trolled by the State agency, ~~(42)\$20,475,000~~ \$21,500,000
 15 (43), of which not more than \$87,346 shall be available for
 16 personal services, and of which not to exceed \$175,000 shall
 17 be available to the Federal Security Administrator for provid-
 18 ing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District
 19 of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which
 20 latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses in
 21 connection with providing such services in the District of
 22 Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 per centum of
 23 the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes.

24 Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and
 25 Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after

1 May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in
 2 accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as
 3 amended (including the objects specified in the preceding
 4 paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding
 5 fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations
 6 incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged
 7 to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*,
 8 That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not
 9 exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of
 10 the current fiscal year.

11 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in car-
 12 rying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation
 13 Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936
 14 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for
 15 production, purchase, and distribution of educational films;
 16 ~~(44)\$705,000~~ \$675,620 ~~(45)~~, of which not more than
 17 \$558,220 shall be available for personal services.

18 PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

19 For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public
 20 Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A)
 21 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, includ-
 22 ing (with the exception of the appropriation "Pay, and so
 23 forth, commissioned officers, Public Health Service") pur-
 24 chase of reports, documents, and other material for publica-
 25 tion; preparation and display of posters and exhibits by con-

1 tract or otherwise; packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating,
2 drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commis-
3 sioned officers and transportation of their dependents on
4 change of station; and increased allowances to Reserve
5 officers for foreign service; as follows:

6 Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections
7 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases
8 including the operation and maintenance of centers for the
9 diagnosis, treatment, support, and clothing of persons afflicted
10 with venereal diseases; transportation and subsistence of such
11 persons and their attendants to and from the place of treat-
12 ment or allowance in lieu thereof; diagnosis and treatment
13 (including emergency treatment for other illnesses) of such
14 persons through contracts with physicians and hospitals and
15 other appropriate institutions; fees for case finding and
16 referral to such centers of voluntary patients; reasonable
17 expenses of preparing remains or burial of deceased patients;
18 recreational supplies and equipment; leasing of facilities
19 and repair and alteration of leased facilities; the purchase of
20 not to exceed (46)~~fifteen~~ *seven* passenger motor vehicles for
21 replacement only, and for grants of money, services, supplies,
22 equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the
23 Act, and with the approval of the respective State health
24 authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political
25 subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such

1 amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon
 2 General may determine; ~~(47)\$11,700,000~~ \$11,653,360
 3 ~~(48)~~, of which not more than \$2,786,157 shall be available
 4 for personal services.

5 Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314
 6 (b) of the Act, ~~(49)\$8,745,000~~ \$8,887,351 ~~(50)~~, of which
 7 not more than \$2,140,323 shall be available for personal
 8 services.

9 Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes
 10 of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative serv-
 11 ices to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make
 12 field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section
 13 301 of the Act; and to provide for collecting and compiling
 14 mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics (including procure-
 15 ment by contract of transcripts of State, municipal, and other
 16 records), including the purchase of not to exceed ~~(51)ten~~
 17 five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$15,-
 18 960,000 ~~(52)~~, of which not more than \$1,900,944 shall be
 19 available for personal services.

20 Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as other-
 21 wise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, 361,
 22 and 704 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression
 23 of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate
 24 transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase,

1 erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; the purchase
 2 of not to exceed ~~(53)twenty~~ *ten* passenger motor vehicles
 3 and two aircraft for replacement only; and hire, maintenance,
 4 and operation of aircraft; ~~(54)\$6,090,000~~ *\$5,915,747* ~~(55)~~,
 5 *of which not more than \$4,450,816 shall be available for*
 6 *personal services.*

7 Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For
 8 expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out
 9 those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act
 10 relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental
 11 health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws
 12 and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out
 13 the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C.
 14 466-466 (j)), including purchase of not to exceed ~~(56)eleven~~
 15 ~~passenger motor vehicles, of which nine shall be for replace-~~
 16 ~~ment only~~ *four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only;*
 17 ~~(57)\$3,710,000~~ *\$3,648,158* ~~(58)~~, *of which not more than*
 18 *\$2,885,004 shall be available for personal services.*

19 Grants, water pollution control: For grants to carry out
 20 section 8 (a) of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S.
 21 C. 466-466 (j)), \$900,000, to remain available until
 22 expended.

23 Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Terri-
 24 tory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct
 25 in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory

1 of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the inves-
 2 tigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and
 3 the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation
 4 services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections
 5 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of sub-
 6 sections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth
 7 in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704 of
 8 the Act, including the purchase of one passenger motor
 9 vehicle, and hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft,
 10 ~~(59)\$1,234,000~~ *\$1,211,129* ~~(60)~~, of which not more than
 11 *\$434,547* shall be available for personal services: *Provided,*
 12 That property of the Public Health Service located in Alaska
 13 and used in carrying out the activities herein authorized may
 14 be transferred, without reimbursement, to the Territory of
 15 Alaska at the discretion of the Surgeon General.

16 Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio: For payment
 17 of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under
 18 the head "Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio," Gen-
 19 eral Services Administration, in the Independent Offices
 20 Appropriation Act, 1951, \$2,400,000, to remain available
 21 until expended.

22 Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hos-
 23 pital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as
 24 amended, to remain available until expended, ~~(61)\$175,-~~
 25 ~~000,000~~ *\$195,000,000*, of which \$100,000,000 is for pay-

1 ment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore
 2 granted under this head: *Provided*, That allotments under
 3 such part C to the several States for the current fiscal year
 4 shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to that part
 5 of the appropriation granted herein which is available for
 6 new obligations.

7 Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services:
 8 For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI
 9 of the Act, as amended, including the purchase of not to
 10 exceed ~~(62)three passenger motor vehicles one passenger~~
 11 ~~motor vehicle~~ for replacement only ~~(63)\$1,195,000 \$1,166,-~~
 12 ~~465 (64)~~, of which not more than \$1,017,165 shall be
 13 available for personal services.

14 Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the func-
 15 tions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8,
 16 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324,
 17 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the
 18 Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of
 19 February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm
 20 products and livestock; purchase of not to exceed ~~(65)fifteen~~
 21 ~~nine~~ passenger motor vehicles, including four ambulances, for
 22 replacement only; and firearms and ammunitions; \$30,200,-
 23 000: *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service estab-
 24 lishes or operates a health service program for any department

1 or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in
2 advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

3 Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the pur-
4 poses of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing
5 the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign coun-
6 tries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with
7 section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of
8 quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the
9 Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the
10 Public Health Service are not available, including insurance
11 of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required
12 by law of such countries; and the purchase of not to exceed
13 ~~(66) twelve passenger motor vehicles of which ten shall be~~
14 ~~for replacement only five passenger motor vehicles for re-~~
15 ~~placement only; (67) \$2,990,000 \$2,868,029 (68), of which~~
16 ~~not more than \$2,507,458 shall be available for personal~~
17 ~~services.~~

18 National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For
19 the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not other-
20 wise provided for, including research fellowships and grants
21 for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; the
22 regulation and preparation of biologic products; the purchase
23 of not to exceed ~~(69) six~~ *three* passenger motor vehicles for
24 replacement only; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of

1 visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon
 2 General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of
 3 adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH), cortisone, and other
 4 chemical substances, and for development of other related
 5 compounds; ~~(70)\$15,500,000~~ \$15,559,973 (71), of which
 6 not more than \$4,560,505 shall be available for personal
 7 services.

8 National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon
 9 General, upon the recommendations of the National Ad-
 10 visory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research
 11 and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with
 12 State health agencies, and other public and private non-
 13 profit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradica-
 14 tion of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstra-
 15 tions, and grants-in-aid; for the purchase of not to exceed
 16 ~~(72)four~~ two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only;
 17 and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A,
 18 of the Act; ~~(73)\$19,500,000~~ \$19,805,171 (74), of which
 19 not more than \$2,694,760 shall be available for personal
 20 services, of which not less than \$4,625,000 shall be available
 21 exclusively for payment of obligations for research and train-
 22 ing grants incurred under authority heretofore granted under
 23 this head.

24 Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for
 25 carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311,

1 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases,
 2 ~~(75)\$10,300,000~~ \$10,737,974 ~~(76)~~, of which not more than
 3 \$1,178,489 shall be available for personal services, of which
 4 not less than \$573,000 shall be available exclusively for
 5 payment of obligations for research and training grants
 6 incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

7 National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to
 8 carry on the purposes of the National Heart Act, including
 9 the purchase of not to exceed ~~(77)two passenger motor~~
 10 ~~vehicles~~ one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only,
 11 ~~(78)\$10,000,000~~ \$10,072,982 ~~(79)~~, of which not more
 12 than \$1,463,333 shall be available for personal services.

13 Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise
 14 provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to
 15 carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental
 16 diseases and conditions, ~~(80)\$1,500,000~~ \$1,697,308
 17 ~~(81)~~, of which not more than \$1,001,156 shall be available
 18 for personal services.

19 Construction of research facilities: For construction of
 20 research facilities, to be transferred (except such part as may
 21 be necessary for incidental expenses and purchase of equip-
 22 ment by the Public Health Service) to the General Services
 23 Administration, and to remain available until expended, as
 24 follows:

25 For continuation of construction of a combined hospital

1 and research building as authorized under this head in the
 2 Federal Security Agency Appropriation Acts of 1949 and
 3 1950, **(82)**~~\$10,400,000~~, \$9,445,000 **(83)**, together with
 4 \$955,000 to be derived by transfer from funds provided for
 5 the construction of additional auxiliary structures under this
 6 head in the Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1951, of
 7 which \$10,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred
 8 under authority heretofore granted under this head.

9 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
 10 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of
 11 auxiliary service area structures, as authorized under this
 12 head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
 13 1950, \$300,000.

14 For payment of obligations incurred under authority
 15 heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of
 16 additional auxiliary structures as authorized under this
 17 head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act,
 18 1951, **(84)**~~\$350,000~~ \$250,000 **(85)**: *Provided, That the*
 19 *Surgeon General is authorized, on such terms and conditions*
 20 *as he determines are appropriate for the efficient operation*
 21 *of the combined hospital and research building, to lease for*
 22 *a total of not more than 99 years a portion of the present*
 23 *site of the National Institutes of Health for the construction,*
 24 *operation, and maintenance thereon by the lessee of rental*
 25 *quarters but not to exceed two hundred and fifty units limited*

1 *exclusively to occupancy of employees of the National Insti-*
 2 *tutes of Health and necessary related facilities, such quarters*
 3 *and facilities to be constructed and operated with regard to*
 4 *local zoning limitations, but to be subject for the term of*
 5 *the lease to State and local taxation on the same basis as*
 6 *other property in the community: Provided further, That*
 7 *not more than \$50,000 of the amounts heretofore appro-*
 8 *priated for the construction of additional auxiliary struc-*
 9 *tures under this head shall be available for expenditure by the*
 10 *Public Health Service for the preparation of plans and*
 11 *specifications for the construction on the property leased*
 12 *pursuant to the preceding provision, such expenditure to be*
 13 *repaid by the lessee and credited to such appropriation.*

14 For purchase and installation of additional equipment,
 15 supplies, and furnishings for structures heretofore provided
 16 under this head, ~~(86)\$6,640,000~~ \$6,635,540 ~~(87)~~, of which
 17 not more than \$84,740 shall be available for personal services.

18 Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth: For pay, uni-
 19 forms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for
 20 foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed
 21 one thousand five hundred regular active commissioned
 22 officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular
 23 and reserve commissioned officers; for payment of claims for
 24 private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or
 25 damaged in the military service of the United States, as

1 authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 222c, h; 42 U. S. C. 213) ;
 2 and for six months' death gratuity pay and burial payments
 3 for regular commissioned officers; ~~(88)\$1,790,000~~ \$1,861,-
 4 500 ~~(89)~~, of which not more than \$731,500 shall be available
 5 for personal services, and the Surgeon General is author-
 6 ized to advance to this appropriation from appropriations
 7 made available to the Public Health Service for the current
 8 fiscal year such additional amounts as may be necessary for
 9 pay and allowances of the officers herein authorized.

10 Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the
 11 Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses
 12 of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere,
 13 including conducting research on technical nursing standards
 14 and furnishing consultative nursing services; preparing in-
 15 formation, articles, and publications related to public health;
 16 conducting studies and demonstrations in public health
 17 methods; carrying on international health activities, including
 18 not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other
 19 countries when specifically authorized by the Surgeon Gen-
 20 eral; and purchase of not to exceed ~~(90)two~~ passenger
 21 ~~motor vehicles~~ one passenger motor vehicle for replacement
 22 only; ~~(91)\$2,850,000~~ \$2,745,868 ~~(92)~~, of which not more
 23 than \$2,320,514 shall be available for personal services.

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the hospital, including purchase of not to exceed (93) ~~three passenger motor vehicles~~ *one passenger motor vehicle* for replacement only, clothing for patients and cooperation with organizations or individuals in scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention, and treatment of mental illness, \$2,135,000.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction, \$136,500, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: For expenses necessary for the supervision of Federal credit unions, (94) ~~\$175,000~~ \$167,650, together with the aggregate of amounts received from certificate, supervision, and examination fees collected from Federal credit unions as authorized by law (95), *of which total sum not more than \$614,650 shall be available for personal services.*

1 Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Sur-
 2 vivors Insurance: For necessary expenses, including pur-
 3 chase of (96)~~four~~ *two* passenger motor vehicles; and furnish-
 4 ing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equip-
 5 ment used by building guards; not more than (97)~~\$58,000,~~
 6 ~~000~~ \$57,437,980 may be expended from the Federal old-age
 7 and survivors insurance trust fund (98), *of which not more*
 8 *than \$48,697,378 shall be available for personal services.*

9 Reimbursement to Federal old-age and survivors in-
 10 surance trust fund: For reimbursement to the Federal old-
 11 age and survivors insurance trust fund for administrative
 12 costs and for benefits paid during the period July 1, 1949
 13 through August 31, 1950 to the survivors of veterans of
 14 World War II eligible for benefits as provided under section
 15 210 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C.
 16 410), \$3,734,000.

17 Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to
 18 States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children,
 19 aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally
 20 disabled, as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the
 21 Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7,
 22 subch. I, IV, and X, 64 Stat. 477), (99)~~\$1,250,000,000~~
 23 \$1,150,000,000, of which such amount as may be necessary
 24 shall be available for grants for any period in the prior fiscal
 25 year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance:

For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance,

~~(100)\$1,463,400~~ \$1,600,000 ~~(101)~~, of which not more than

\$1,455,400 shall be available for personal services.

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary

expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as

amended (29 U. S. C. 18a), and title V of the Social Security

Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including

purchase of reports and material for the publications of

the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution,

~~(102)\$1,450,000~~ \$1,500,000 ~~(103)~~, of which not more than

\$1,238,900 shall be available for personal services: *Pro-*

vided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this

title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any in-

structions, order, or regulation relating to the care of ob-

stetrical cases which discriminate between persons licensed

under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided further*,

That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to

prevent any patient from having the services of any prac-

titioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long

as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*, That

any State plan which provides standards for professional

obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State

shall be approved.

Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For

1 grants to States for maternal and child-health services, serv-
 2 ices for crippled children, and child-welfare services as au-
 3 thorized in title V, parts 1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security
 4 Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V),
 5 ~~(104)\$30,000,000~~ \$33,000,000: *Provided*, That any allot-
 6 ment to a State pursuant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of
 7 such Act shall not be included in computing for the purposes
 8 of subsections (a) and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such
 9 Act an amount expended or estimated to be expended by the
 10 State ~~(105):~~ *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall
 11 be allotted on a pro rata basis among the several States in
 12 proportion to the amounts to which the respective States are
 13 entitled for the current fiscal year by reason of section ~~334~~
 14 of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1950.

15 Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For
 16 expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for
 17 Social Security, ~~(106)\$249,700~~ \$200,000, together with not
 18 to exceed ~~(107)\$140,300~~ \$100,000 to be transferred from
 19 the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

20 Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For mak-
 21 ing, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments
 22 to States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respec-
 23 tively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first
 24 quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may
 25 be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures

1 made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to
 2 be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

3 In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV,
 4 respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, pay-
 5 ments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter
 6 in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending
 7 June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to
 8 a State plan approved under such title prior to or during
 9 such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect
 10 to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which
 11 such plan was submitted for approval (108): *Provided, That*
 12 *no State which has, by legislative enactment, provided the*
 13 *conditions under which public access may be had to the records*
 14 *of the disbursements of grants-in-aid funds shall be denied*
 15 *its allocation of Federal funds under titles I, IV, X, and*
 16 *XIV if such State has otherwise complied with the governing*
 17 *statutory provisions.*

18 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

19 Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office of
 20 the Administrator, (109) ~~\$2,050,000~~ \$2,150,000, together
 21 with not to exceed (110) ~~\$403,000~~ \$413,000 to be trans-
 22 ferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust
 23 fund: *Provided, That the Administrator may advance to this*
 24 *appropriation from appropriations of constituent organiza-*
 25 *tions of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be*

1 necessary to finance the regional office activities of such
2 constituent organizations.

3 Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:
4 For expenses necessary for the office of the Administrator,
5 including salaries for the Division of Service Operations; and
6 purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement
7 only; \$711,500, together with not to exceed \$123,500 to
8 be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors in-
9 surance trust fund (111), *of which total sum not more than*
10 *\$402,045 shall be available for personal services: Provided,*
11 *That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation*
12 *from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Fed-*
13 *eral Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to*
14 *cover the charges for services, supplies, equipment, and*
15 *materials furnished.*

16 Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Salaries, Office of
17 the General Counsel, (112) ~~\$412,000~~ \$396,478, together
18 with not to exceed \$22,950 to be transferred from the
19 appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certification and in-
20 spection services", and not to exceed \$389,000 to be trans-
21 ferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance
22 trust fund.

23 Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for
24 carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k)
25 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of

1 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal
2 excess property for educational purposes and protection of
3 public health, (113) ~~\$100,000~~ \$75,000.

4 GENERAL PROVISIONS

5 SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for
6 salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of
7 estimates of appropriations in the field, and for payment
8 in advance when authorized by the Federal Security Ad-
9 ministrator for dues or fees for library membership in
10 organizations whose publications are available to members
11 only or to members at a price lower than to the general
12 public.

13 SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for
14 salaries and expenses shall be available for services as
15 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
16 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

17 SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available
18 for salaries and expenses shall be available for travel ex-
19 penses and for expenses of attendance at meetings con-
20 cerned with the function or activity for which any such ap-
21 propriation is made.

22 SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this
23 title to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid
24 of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of
25 operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses

1 of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld
 2 from the said agencies of any States which have established
 3 by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit sys-
 4 tem and classification and compensation plan covering the
 5 selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their em-
 6 ployees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the
 7 manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States,
 8 or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

9 This title may be cited as the "Federal Security
 10 Agency Appropriation Act, 1952".

11 TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS 12 BOARD

13 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 14 National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions
 15 vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947
 16 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including
 17 expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work
 18 of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman
 19 or the General Counsel; and services as authorized by section
 20 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a);
 21 ~~(114)\$8,000,000~~ \$8,233,959 ~~(115)~~, of which not more
 22 than \$6,622,284 shall be available for personal services:
 23 *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be avail-
 24 able to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers

1 or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives,
 2 or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agri-
 3 cultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the Act
 4 of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the
 5 Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in
 6 section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060).

7 This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations
 8 Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

9 TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

10 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
 11 National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting
 12 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
 13 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~(116)\$400,000~~ \$394,247 (117), of
 14 *which not more than \$299,307 shall be available for personal*
 15 *services.*

16 Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses nec-
 17 essary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of
 18 the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157),
 19 and emergency boards appointed by the President pursuant
 20 to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including
 21 stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15
 22 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), ~~(118)\$150,-~~
 23 ~~000 \$144,000~~ (119), *of which not more than \$114,000 shall*
 24 *be available for personal services.*

1 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

2 Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the
3 National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic
4 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
5 August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$600,000, ~~(120)~~ *of which*
6 *not more than \$460,774 shall be available for personal serv-*
7 *ices and* of which not less than \$250,000 shall be available
8 for compensation (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and
9 expenses of referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the
10 Railway Labor Act, as amended.

11 This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board
12 Appropriation Act, 1952".

13 TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

14 ~~(121)~~ Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual
15 premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions,
16 and death benefits, in accordance with the provisions of the
17 Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended
18 ~~(45 U. S. C. 228-228s)~~; and for expenses necessary for the
19 Railroad Retirement Board in the administration of said Acts
20 as specifically provided for under this title, for crediting to
21 the railroad retirement account, an amount equal to amounts
22 covered into the Treasury ~~(minus refunds)~~ during the cur-
23 rent fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act
24 ~~(28 U. S. C. 1500-1538)~~.

1 *Railroad retirement account: For an amount sufficient*
 2 *as an annual premium for the payments required under the*
 3 *Railroad Retirement Acts of August 29, 1935, and June 24,*
 4 *1937, and authorized to be appropriated to the railroad*
 5 *retirement account established under section 15 (a) of the*
 6 *latter Act, \$562,534,409: Provided, That such total amount*
 7 *shall be available until expended for making payments re-*
 8 *quired under said retirement acts, and the amount not*
 9 *required for current payments shall be invested by the Sec-*
 10 *retary of the Treasury in accordance with the provisions*
 11 *of said Railroad Retirement Act of June 24, 1937.*

12 Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust
 13 fund) : For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement
 14 Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of at-
 15 tendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board
 16 when specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic
 17 reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
 18 of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; ~~(122)\$5,268,000~~
 19 \$5,056,904, to be derived from the railroad retirement ac-
 20 count ~~(123)~~, of which not more than \$4,010,820 shall be
 21 available for personal services.

22 This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement
 23 Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND
CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; ~~(124)\$2,949,000~~ \$3,047,000 ~~(125)~~, of which not more than \$2,566,653 shall be available for personal services.

Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176-180, 182), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of Columbia, ~~(126)\$50,000~~ \$48,750 ~~(127)~~, of which not more than \$23,750 shall be available for personal services.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1952".

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by

1 force or violence and accepts employment the salary or
 2 wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained
 3 in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction,
 4 shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not
 5 more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the
 6 above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in
 7 substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

8 SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in
 9 this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes
 10 not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

11 ~~(128)~~SEC. 703. No part of any appropriations or authoriza-
 12 tions contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensa-
 13 tion of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position
 14 which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning
 15 on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not
 16 apply—

17 ~~(a)~~ to not to exceed 25 per centum of all such
 18 vacancies.

19 ~~(b)~~ to positions filled from within the agency.

20 ~~(c)~~ to offices or positions required by law to be
 21 filled by appointment of the President by and with the
 22 advice and consent of the Senate.

23 ~~(d)~~ to nurses, doctors, or other medical personnel,

including orderlies, in the Public Health Service; St. Elizabeths Hospital and Freedmen's Hospital.

(e) to employees in grades C. P. C. 1 and 2.

(129) SEC. 703. Each appropriation or authorization made by this Act for any purpose, of which a specified portion is herein made available for personal services, and each amount so specified as being available for personal services, is hereby reduced by an amount equal to 5 per centum of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in budget estimates heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952.

(130) SEC. 704. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government, whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle (other than a bus or ambulance), and any funds appropriated in this Act for any such purpose shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(131) SEC. 705. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only is reduced by the provisions in this Act the total number of passenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number.

1 (132)SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in
 2 this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any em-
 3 ployee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that
 4 would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one
 5 hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time,
 6 and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: Provided,
 7 That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered
 8 as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more
 9 in personnel administration consisting of direction and ad-
 10 ministration of the personnel program; employment, place-
 11 ment, and separation; job evaluation and classification; em-
 12 ployee relations and services; training; committees of expert
 13 examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage
 14 administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

15 SEC. (133)704 707. This Act may be cited as the
 16 "Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1952".

Passed the House of Representatives April 18, 1951.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
 Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments June 14 (legisla-
 tive day, May 17), 1951.

Attest: LESLIE L. BIFFLE,
 Secretary.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 14, 1951

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

that our gallant forces have gone forth to defend and preserve our way of life.

Today, on this anniversary, our soldiers, sailors, and marines are fighting alongside the armed forces of other free nations to preserve the light of freedom.

As we pause to pray for these brave men, let us not forget that each of us must remain eternally vigilant if freedom is to prevail.

With our united support, our Armed Forces will secure the victory; they will match the record of all those brave men who have loved liberty so dearly that when necessary they were glad to fight and even to die for it.

Regardless of political beliefs, this is a day for all patriotic citizens to unite and pledge our wholehearted support to the fight to preserve democracy.

This is a proud day for America.

This is a day of unusual importance to all West Virginians because our own Two Hundred and First armored field artillery battalion—"Fairmont's finest"—is the only living descendant of the original eight companies that formed the Continental Army on June 14, 1775.

Mr. President, I know I speak for all West Virginia when I pay tribute on this occasion to "Fairmont's finest," the only known unit today that displays both Confederate and Union streamers.

My distinguished colleague and long-time personal friend, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], is much better qualified to give this tribute, because he served with distinction in the Two Hundred and First AFA.

This battalion is now on active duty at Fort Benning, Ga., having been inducted into the Federal service last September, and I know it will serve its country with great devotion.

Mr. President, the June 11, 1951, issue of the Fairmont Times, edited by a widely known and highly respected gentleman, Mr. C. E. Smith, carried a very interesting article about the Two Hundred and First AFA. I ask unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**TWO HUNDRED AND FIRST BATTALION ONLY
LIVING UNIT DIRECTLY DESCENDED FROM
FIRST UNITED STATES ARMY**

When the United States Army celebrates its one hundred and seventy-sixth birthday next Thursday, Fairmont's own Two Hundred and First Armored Field Artillery Battalion will be singled out for special honors as the only living descendant of the original eight companies that formed the Army on June 14, 1775.

Information that the Two Hundred and First Armored Field Artillery is the lone unit now in service which is descended from one of the original companies making up the Army has just been disclosed by the National Guard Bureau in the Department of the Army.

The same source also reveals that the Two Hundred and First is the only known unit today that displays both Union and Confederate streamers for participation in both sides of the Civil War. The battalion unites companies that once served in opposing armies.

Maj. Lawrence G. Brown, of Fairmont, executive officer of the battalion, which is now in training at Fort Benning, Ga., after

its induction into Federal service last September, was informed by the Times last night of the new honors for the Two Hundred and First that have been disclosed.

He said that a tight training schedule might prevent any elaborate ceremonies honoring the battalion of the Army's birthday, but thought that the report, verified by the Office of Military History, would be read to the organization at a formation on Thursday.

The Army archives disclose that Capt. Hugh Stephenson's company was one of the original eight companies of the United States Army. It and Capt. Daniel Morgan's company came from Virginia and there were two from Maryland and four from Pennsylvania.

"All of the original companies, except Stephenson's (now part of the Two Hundred and First Armored Field Artillery) have passed out of existence," said the report from the National Guard Bureau which was sent to Brig. Gen. Charles R. Fox, adjutant general of West Virginia. "Stephenson's company was organized with men from the volunteer regiment of the time. During the Revolutionary War the company was expanded into a rifle regiment.

"In this connection it is noted that the history of the Two Hundred and First Armored Field Artillery is a regional history and covers the history of the Organized Militia-National Guard supported by the area of the Two Hundred and First Armored Field Artillery through the years. The research done by the Department of the Army incident to publishing official statements of lineage and battle honors is done from the point of view of the color-bearing unit, i. e., regiment or battalion. Company histories, as such, are not being done. The action of Captain Stephenson's company affects the lineage and battle honors of the battalion and therefore is recorded."

With reference to the battle streamers of the Union and Confederacy and the blue and gray in the heraldry of the battalion's coat of arms, the Army report makes this comment:

"There is no record that the Two Hundred and First Armored Field Artillery or any of its companies fought on both sides in the Civil War. The companies that left and fought with the Confederacy were inactivated in 1862; doubtless the men returned home and lived quietly until the stigma (in West Virginia) of their Confederate service wore off. Captain Alburts, it appears, was an ardent Confederate sympathizer. The companies that fought for the Union remained in service from 1861 to 1865. After West Virginia became a separate State, these units were designated the Second West Virginia Veteran Volunteer Infantry Regiment (1864). In 1878 the descendants of the Union and Confederate companies were united in the First Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Militia.

"Other border States, Maryland, for example, had units on both sides in the Civil War, but no other unit today appears entitled to display both Confederate and Union streamers."

There had been previous records obtained from the Army archives that the Two Hundred and First was one of the four oldest military units in the country. The official records now disclose that the Fairmont Battalion, as it is generally known at Fort Benning, is the only one which maintains an unbroken line of service from the creation of the first United States Army to the present time.

Headquarters of the battalion are in the National Guard Armory in Jackson Street, and this city is the home of the headquarters company and A Battery. Other companies come from Martinsburg, Keyser, and Terra Alta, Kingwood.

The battalion, which now includes draftees from other sections of the country, has been undergoing intensive training at

Fort Benning. Firing problems were on the schedule for this week, Major Brown said.

Unbrigaded with any other military organization, the Two Hundred and First not only appears to be on the way to becoming one of the Army's elite units but one whose history is unparalleled in the Nation's military service at the present time.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

[Mr. NEELY resumed and concluded the speech begun by him yesterday. His speech in its entirety is as follows:]

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, before addressing myself to the subject matter which I purpose to discuss, please let me warmly congratulate the Senate and the people upon the outstanding, patient, patriotic service rendered them by our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who conducted the voluminous hearings on the pending bill for more than 2 months. Unfortunately the measure which they reported has been seriously impaired by the amendments with which it has been encumbered by those who apparently know more about the cost of everything than they care about the worth of anything.

Mr. President, a great Scotchman gave the world these impressive lines:

Man, whose heav'n-erected face
The smiles of love adorn—
Man's inhumanity to man
Makes countless thousands mourn.

The spirit of a Senate rule restrains me from characterizing the adoption of the Ferguson appropriation-slashing amendment as an inhuman act. But I nevertheless believe that its operation will make many thousands of victims of cancer, heart disease, and other dire afflictions mourn.

Mr. President, let me establish a factual basis for my plea to recommit the bill, to the end that the various health services specified in my motion may be exempted from the blighting effect of the Ferguson amendment.

According to the most conservative estimates obtainable, the United States has, during the last year, directly spent at least \$5,000,000,000 to prosecute the war in Korea against vast armies of well-equipped and thoroughly trained, fanatical, bloodthirsty Communists. But notwithstanding the countless numbers of our foes, they have succeeded in killing only 11,413 of our Armed Forces since the 25th day of last June. During this very same period cancer killed not 11,000 but 200,000 American people. During this same period heart disease also killed more than 700,000 American people. Yet the proposed appropriation of \$19,000,000 to combat cancer—the world's most agonizing scourge—has been reduced more than \$141,000; and the proposed \$10,072,000 appropriation for the Heart Institute has been reduced more than \$77,000 by the Ferguson amendment.

No Senator ever has complained or ever will complain of our having spent \$5,000,000,000 to defeat a foe in far-off Asia that killed fewer than 12,000 of our troops in a year. But, in the circumstances, can anyone offer a scintilla of justification for reducing an appropriation of less than \$20,000,000 to protect the American people against an enemy not in far-off Asia, but at their very door, an enemy more than sixteen times as deadly as the foreign foe against which we spent 250 times \$20,000,000 last year.

Since heart disease kills more than three times as many people as cancer, the 5 percent slash in the appropriation for the Heart Institute is, if possible, even more astounding than the reduction in the appropriation for the eradication of the cancer scourge.

The first funeral, which proceeded from the House of Representatives of the Sixty-third Congress, of which I was a member, was that of a victim of cancer from the State of New Jersey.

The latest senatorial death was also caused by the cancer monster that knows no pity and shows no mercy.

On the average, cancer destroys some man, woman, or child in this country every 43 seconds. Since the Senate convened 40 minutes ago, cancer has killed 12 persons in the United States.

Mr. President, unless the Ferguson amendment is neutralized in accordance with my motion to recommit, all the following will seriously suffer:

1. Experimentation for the relief of arteriosclerosis.
2. The development of recent discoveries producing blood needed for transfusions in case of atomic attack.
3. The development of a newly discovered technique for growing experimental cancer cells.
4. The work now being done to obtain greater quantities of cortisone for arthritic, heart, and cancer patients.
5. The development of a drug which promises to lead to the eradication of malaria.
6. A project for obtaining sex hormones from tomato vines for therapeutic work re cancer and change of life.
7. Experimentation to establish the relationship between body processes and mental diseases.
8. Work in the treatment of venereal diseases, tuberculosis and ailments resulting from exposure to radioactive materials.
9. The development of a recent discovery to alleviate the dire consequences of high-blood pressure.

In addition to the foregoing, the Ferguson amendment cuts would:

- a. Make it extremely difficult to recruit personnel for the \$40,000,000 clinical center in Bethesda, which is being built to pursue studies re: cancer, heart, and mental health problems.
- b. Retard cooperative work with the States in health and safety matters relating to civil defense.
- c. Impair the operation of foreign quarantine—which is now a more serious problem than ever before because of increased international travel.

Mr. President, I entreat those who voted for the Ferguson amendment to reverse themselves and vote for the motion to recommit, and thus avert the calamitous consequences which would otherwise be suffered by these priceless activities and services.

Let us hope that those who have reduced the appropriation for the agonized victims of cancer will not be visited with the misfortune that descended upon two very capable Members of the House of Representatives who, in the Seventy-ninth Congress, both by voice and vote, most effectually helped to defeat a bill I had introduced in behalf of an appropriation for \$100,000,000 with which to mobilize the cancer experts of the world to make an all-out effort to destroy the most loathsome and terrifying of all destroyers, and thus rid the world of its greatest curse. Within a year after three outstanding debaters of the House made attacks on my bill, one of these was afflicted with a cancer on his face. Prompt and modern treatment has, as I sincerely hope and believe, completely healed this victim. Another of these three opponents was stricken with an internal cancer. After a year and a half of agony, death mercifully ended this able man's career.

Mr. President, according to medical authority, one-eighth of all the people of the Nation will die of cancer. But since many members of the Senate are past middle age, their cancer death rate will certainly be above the average. It is probable that one of every five of the present Members will eventually become a wretched victim of the cancer curse.

Let us bear this well in mind not that our days may be darkened with gloom and consumed with fear but rather that we may be up and doing while opportunity's sun still shines. Let us endeavor to the limit of our capacity, to speed cancer research until humanity's victory over this hideous foe has been decisively won.

It is regrettable that many Senators, who for many days have apparently been diligently striving for preeminence in the matter of slashing appropriations for the alleviation of human misery and misfortune, have on this occasion elected to absent themselves from the Chamber. I am particularly sorry that the two great and honorable Senators from the State of Illinois are not here. The able junior Senator from that State [Mr. DIRKSEN], as a Member of the Seventy-ninth Congress, made a most eloquent and impressive speech in behalf of my bill to appropriate \$100,000,000 with which to finance the anticancer war. Consequently, I was simply amazed when he voted for the Ferguson amendment, which is designed to reduce by 5 percent the pending proposed appropriation of less than \$20,000,000 with which to conquer cancer.

I was also greatly disappointed when the senior Senator from Illinois, who is not only a great debater but, on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays also a great liberal, appeared to me to be striving to surpass his junior colleague in the matter of cutting more and more and more from the human welfare appropriations carried in the bill. Indeed, what seemed to be an appropriation-cutting oral contest between these distinguished gentlemen forcefully reminds me of a story that the famous Senator

"Bob" Taylor told on this floor during the Wilson administration. He said that the birds had a contest to determine which could fly the highest. Eventually the American eagle, soaring above all of its visible competitors, scornfully looked down on all those below it, and screamed: "I'm higher than all the rest. I'm the highest of the high." But instantly a squeaking voice cried: "I'm higher than you are. I'm higher than you are." The eagle turned his head, and, with unsurpassable consternation, discovered that a tomtit was on his back taking a free ride high above all the other birds, including the eagle himself.

Mr. President, let me make it plain that I do not mean to compare either of the distinguished Senators from Illinois to any bird, whether tomtit or eagle, for many reasons—one of which is that I would not accuse either an eagle or a tomtit of having voted to cut a proposed appropriation for combatting cancer and other agonizing human afflictions. And, secondly, if a comparison has to be made between these two distinguished Senators, I should wish it to be made by the people of their native State who, I am certain, would have infinitely more ability and exercise infinitely more prudence in rendering their decision than was attributed to the humble little flea by Stephen Leacock, an outstanding college professor who never committed the unpardonable sin of taking himself too seriously or of losing his sense of humor. He wrote in one of his humorous moments:

And there's the bounding little flea,
You cannot tell a female from a he,
The sexes look alike, you see;
But he can tell and so can she.

Mr. President, so will the people of Illinois eventually be able to pass judgment on their two outstanding Senators who have rendered truly unusual service in slashing proposed appropriations designed to alleviate the agencies caused by cancer and to save the lives of the countless victims of heart disease.

Mr. President, I am sorry that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for whom I have a very high regard, is not present. I would have thought that, because of the prolonged agony and final death of his beloved, illustrious colleague, which was caused by cancer, he above all other Senators would have fought to the last parliamentary ditch for a greater instead of a lesser appropriation with which to carry on our anticancer war. It is my hope that the nobility of his nature may yet impel him to help protect the vast army of cancer victims from the distressingly harmful effects of his 5-percent amendment.

Mr. President, the people of the United States spent more than a billion dollars last year for face powder, nail polish and lipstick. Had the Congress 10 years ago appropriated an equal sum for cancer research, this life-and-death problem would, in my opinion, long since have been so completely solved that it never would have plagued mankind again.

The able, liberal, beloved Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who honors us

with his presence, delivered on the subject before the Senate a most remarkable address which should have been heard by everyone in the land. Alexander Pope, in his "Essay on Man," wrote the following:

Never elated while one man's oppress'd;
Never dejected while another's bless'd.

John Ruskin said that Pope had "summed up the law of noble life in these two lines, which are the most complete, the most concise and the most lofty expression of moral temper existing in English words." In my opinion, the humanitarian address of the Senator from Vermont is just as deserving of Mr. Ruskin's commendation as were the famous lines to which they were originally applied.

Mr. President, it is my hope that so many more progressives like the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the equally great liberal near his side, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], will be elected to the Senate so that the crying necessity for these constantly recurring battles for the proper protection of the common people and the adequate defense of their rights may take its flight from the Senate never to return. Until that happy consummation is realized, let us hope that the insatiable cutters of general welfare appropriations will not happen to find and read Jonathan Swift's ancient, satirical pamphlet, entitled "A Modest Proposal to the Poverty-Stricken, Suffering People of Ireland," in which this embittered man recommended to the distressed Irish people in time of famine that they satisfy their hunger by eating their own children.

Mr. President, it is my hope that when the roll is called on my motion to recommit, the able Senators from Illinois will demonstrate their devotion to the sublime philosophy which the immortal Abraham Lincoln of their State expressed: "I believe in both the man and the dollar, but in a contest between the dollar that man made and the man that God made, put me down on the side of the God-made man every time." And let me voice the further hope that all other Senators who helped to adopt the devastating Ferguson amendment will absolve themselves by voting for the motion to recommit, and thus save themselves the bitter regret in future years of mourning the loss of those friends who prematurely died of cancer or heart disease because of the operation of the Ferguson amendment.

If those who voted to adopt the Ferguson amendment fail to improve this opportunity to escape the responsibility for its disastrous consequences, they will, in my opinion, find it as impossible to clear their conscience in days to come as it was for Pilate, by washing his hands, to escape his guilt for the Saviour's death upon the cross.

On the approaching roll call let us vote for the sick, the suffering, and the needy in obedience to the Master's injunction:

Whatsoever ye would that man should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from West Virginia for his sound and powerful address in support of his motion. The Senator from New Mexico wishes that in this instance he were acting only as a Senator from New Mexico, because he would like to agree with the Senator from West Virginia. However, it so happens that my responsibility in this instance is a little different from that of an individual Senator. I am acting now on behalf of the committee and of the Senate.

I wish the Ferguson amendment had not been adopted. If it had to be adopted, I wish the modification submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] had been adopted. However, this body, contrary to the wishes of the Senator from New Mexico, in charge of the bill, took definite action on those amendments. I am so deeply interested in the items which have been discussed so ably by the Senator from West Virginia that I want to take this bill from the floor and save something, at least, from the wreck.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the distinguished Senator from West Virginia through?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand he is.

Mr. WHERRY. He was entitled to the first hour. Are we now starting on the second hour?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I wish to take 5 or 6 minutes, or perhaps 10 minutes.

Mr. WHERRY. As I understand, we are now in the second hour, and 30 minutes to a side are allotted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The Senator from West Virginia has 12 more minutes which he has not used.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is not my purpose to delay the Senate. I think it has been delayed long enough in taking action on the bill. However, the proposal now being made by the Senator from West Virginia was made in a different way several days ago by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senate took definite action. By a definite vote, it did not agree to the modification offered by the Senator from New York, but voted overwhelmingly for the Ferguson amendment. In order that Senators may be informed as to how definite that vote was, I wish to read to the Senate the names of Senators who voted for the Ferguson amendment. The list is as follows:

BENNETT, BREWSTER, BRICKER, BRIDGES, BUTLER of Maryland, BUTLER of Nebraska, BYRD, CAIN, CARLSON, CONNALLY, DIRKSEN, DOUGLAS, DUFF, DWORSHAK, EASTLAND, ECTON, FERGUSON, FLANDERS, FREAR, FULLERIGHT, GEORGE, GILLETTE, HENDRICKSON, HICKENLOOPER, HOEY, HOLLAND, IVES, JENNER, JOHNSON of Colorado, JOHNSON of Texas, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KNOWLAND, LANGER, MALONE, MCCARRAN, MCCARTHY, McCLELLAN, McKELLAR, MORSE, MUNDT, NIXON, ROBERTSON, RUSSELL, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPPEL, SMATHERS, SMITH of Maine, SMITH of New Jersey, SMITH of North Carolina, STENNIS, TAFT, THYE, WATKINS, WELKER, WHERRY, WILLIAMS, YOUNG.

The list includes possibly 10 members of the Committee on Appropriations who

had voted to report the bill. I feel that we are not doing justice to those whom we should protect, as suggested by the Senator from West Virginia, if we delay the bill longer. I am worried about it. I shall try, at least, to explain to the Senator from West Virginia that possibly the situation will not be as bad as he fears.

Like the Senator from West Virginia, I would not have limited the National Cancer Institute to \$19,805,171. I would have gone the limit of the authorization. However, at the moment we are facing stern realities. Do we wish to save the bill, or do we wish to have an opportunity, even in committee, of taking further action in doing what has been so ably described by the Senator from West Virginia? The committee recommended \$19,805,171 for the National Cancer Institute. The effect of the Ferguson amendment is to reduce it by \$141,830.

In mental health activities the Ferguson amendment would cut \$62,026. Tuberculosis services would be cut by \$112,649; venereal disease research, \$146,640; dental health activities, \$52,692. I do not believe we should have cut one cent. However, 58 Senators said "yes" and 24 Senators said "no." That is the responsibility which the Senator from New Mexico now must face.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall yield in a moment.

In the National Heart Institute item the Ferguson cut would be \$77,018. The appropriation would still be very close to the committee recommendation. The National Health Institutes item would be cut \$240,000, in round figures. In the appropriation for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, in the payments to States, the cut under the Ferguson amendment would be only \$4,597. In the salaries and expenses in the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation the cut would be \$29,388. The Children's Bureau would be cut \$5,205; and I would be sorry to see cuts made in that appropriation.

The only redeeming feature of the cuts is that they generally apply to personnel not of the type that is doing the actual research. I am hopeful that we can convince the House conferees of the soundness and justice of the committee recommendation, even though we could not convince this body. For that reason, Mr. President, notwithstanding that down deep in my heart I agree fully with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], under my responsibility to see that the bill becomes law, I shall have to oppose his motion.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield me some time?

Mr. NEELY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, for whom I have the highest regard, and appreciating the tremendous amount of time, effort, and thought that has gone into the work of the committee, that in

giving the figures with regard to the vote on the Ferguson amendment, I believe he inadvertently told only half the story. It seems to me that the real test came on the vote on the amendment which I offered, which would have exempted various services, most of which were mentioned in the motion to recommit. On the amendment which I offered, the vote was 38 in favor of the amendment, and only 42 in opposition to it. A difference of only three votes would have caused my amendment to prevail.

Mr. President, I am not so pessimistic as is the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] with reference to the recommitment of the bill. I know that we have an uphill fight, but we have a chance to carry the motion to recommit.

With the help of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], I tried to make a motion to reconsider the vote by which my amendment was defeated. I was informed by the Parliamentarian—and I am quite certain that his advice was correct—that such a motion would be out of order. Therefore, the only recourse we had was through a motion to recommit, with instructions to the committee. Such a motion was made by the Senator from West Virginia.

I wish to point out what the motion of the Senator from West Virginia actually would do. It would not change the entire picture with regard to cuts. It would only restore the cuts of 5 percent in personal services in the following activities: National Cancer Institute, mental health activities, tuberculosis services, venereal disease services, dental health activities, National Heart Institute, National Institutes of Health, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Children's Bureau.

Certainly no one can possibly question or doubt the importance, nay, the necessity, of carrying on such activities on a scale at least equal to that on which they were carried on in the past year. I personally believe we should have had much larger appropriations for such essential services. However, we are not asking for larger appropriations. All we are asking for is that the appropriations shall not be reduced. To do so would set back the quality and scope of the services through an arbitrary cut of 5 percent in personnel. Such a cut would inevitably set back the services. It would reduce their effect and scope.

Just how much would be saved by such arbitrary cut? Slightly more than a million dollars. We would be setting slightly more than a million dollars in savings against the hopes of millions of our people.

On one of the occasions on which I have spoken on the bill—and I have spoken on it many times, as Senators know—I said that if the Senate were confronted with a proposal which would save a few hundred lives on appropriation for that purpose would loom too large; that the appropriation would be voted without debate; that it would be voted without any question at all. In this instance we know that the cut would set back work of the various health activities. It is work which is beginning to

roll into high gear. It is work which will undoubtedly save the lives of many thousands of persons who will be stricken by the deadly heart and venereal diseases and cancer. It would save hundreds of thousands of lives and families from the great killer, mental disease, by making it possible to give better treatment and undertake more intensive and intelligent research work.

Will the Senator from West Virginia yield two more minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MOODY in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield more time to the Senator from New York?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I yield two more minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, this is not the time to economize on essential services. I am in favor of economy with respect to everything that is not essential. I am in favor of economy if it will make available to our defense efforts every cent that is needed for that purpose. However, the proposed cuts do not represent economy. Protecting the health of the people of the United States is as much a defense effort as is the purchase of arms and equipment and the training of troops. I say we cannot afford to gamble with a great generation of children, with our crippled children, and with maternal care, and the various other services on which cuts are proposed. We need such services in order to maintain the high level of humanitarian and scientific services in our country.

I beg of my fellow Senators, Mr. President, to vote for the motion of the Senator from West Virginia, so that the arbitrary cuts which have been made will be restored. In my opinion, the cuts which have been made are completely without justification and will severely hurt the people of the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to say that if the motion of the Senator from West Virginia is agreed to, and if the amount which subsequently is restored to the appropriation is the amount stated by the Senator from New York, namely, approximately \$1,000,000, that will mean that one twenty-fifth of 1 percent of the total amount carried in the bill will be provided for the purpose of continuing the work in maternal and child welfare and in research on the various malignant diseases. That is the price we would pay for carrying on this work.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Vermont very much. As usual, his comments are both timely and extremely useful.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for 5 minutes?

Mr. NEELY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, anything I might say at this point, following the eloquent speech of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia in regard to these humanitarian appropriations, would be somewhat of an anti-

climax. However, I wish to call attention to the almost lifetime devotion of the Senator from West Virginia to the cause of combating cancer and other deadly diseases. Long ago, when the Senator from West Virginia was first in the Congress, he started the ball rolling in favor of the establishment in the United States of a cancer research institute. Unfortunately, at that time his goal was not achieved. When I first served in the House of Representatives, I had the privilege and opportunity of joining in that effort with an old friend of ours, from my State, former Senator Homer Bone. Finally, as a result of the groundwork he did, the establishment of the National Cancer Institute was achieved.

After the fine and able presentation the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has made in regard to this problem, I think the RECORD would not be complete without referring to these matters and to the fine work which has been done in this connection. The Senator from West Virginia has been at it a long time. As he has stated, I hope the other Members of the Senate will see the light in regard to this matter and will take the position he has taken.

Adoption of the motion of the Senator from West Virginia will not delay the bill in any way, Mr. President. The motion, if agreed to, would require the bill to be returned from the committee forthwith, with the original amounts of appropriations for these items restored. Technically, that would mean only having the bill sent to the committee and coming back from the committee almost at once. It would take only 2 minutes to do that, and there would be no delay at all in our action on the bill.

So, Mr. President, I hope that Senators who voted the other day for the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]—which, if adopted, would have had the same effect as that of the motion of the Senator from West Virginia—will see how important this matter is.

Some Senators have stated that the cuts which have been made in these appropriations will not amount to much, but I think the RECORD should show just what they will amount to. The Senator from New Mexico has pointed out that the making of these cuts will mean a reduction in the personnel utilized for this research work. Certainly that is the crux of the matter. In that connection, let us consider the National Cancer Institute. When representatives of that institute came before the Appropriations Committee, they testified as to the amount of money they would need to carry out their long-range plans in connection with their research work. They did not ask for more money than they could spend. As Vannevar Bush once told me, "You have to keep scientists and research workers hungry, because then they work harder."

The plans of the National Cancer Institute call for having one university or laboratory in the United States do certain work in regard to cancer research, and another one do other work, and then all the work would be correlated. Thus

we can see how harmful the proposed cut would be, for it would mean the abolishment of approximately 28 scholarships and research fellowships, and the men in those positions have been playing an important part in the drive to find a cure for cancer. As a result, the proposed reduction, although involving only a small amount of money, would require a substantial reduction in the research personnel, and such a reduction would do great harm.

I think a similar situation would exist in the case of the proposed cuts in the appropriations for the programs for research in heart disease and for the other programs which are referred to in the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

After all, Mr. President, the amount of these cuts is really quite small. It is hard to conceive of a naval craft which could be built for the amount of money involved in the proposed cuts, but perhaps two small PT boats could be built with the amount of money which it is proposed to save by making the cuts in the program for cancer research.

I sincerely hope the Senate will agree to restore these funds, because the program has been carefully planned, and only the amounts of money which are needed to carry on the necessary work are requested.

Of course, we know that thus far the cure for cancer has not been found.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Washington has expired.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield one more minute to me?

Mr. NEELY. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized for 1 minute more.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the scientists and physicians inform us that when cancer is diagnosed in its early stages, approximately 41 or 42 percent of the cases can be cured. Therefore, the problem is how to get the American people to be examined in order to determine whether they have cancer.

However, in the entire United States there are only 1,700 pathologists who are able to give the kind of examination required in order to determine whether a person has cancer. Just the other day the Senator from Alabama and I heard testimony in regard to this phase of the problem.

It is most encouraging to learn that as a result of last year's meager appropriation, one researcher—perhaps one who had one of the 28 scholarships which would be canceled as a result of the proposed cuts—devised a machine, which now is in operation, by which it is possible to detect cancer cells and distinguish them from normal cells, and do so very rapidly—in fact, as rapidly as people can walk past the machine. Just think what that development means in connection with cancer research.

Therefore, Mr. President, in view of the entire situation, I hope the Senator from Michigan will join with us, so that we can keep this program going. It was started some years ago, and has made

great progress in alleviating human suffering.

I repeat that the proposed cuts would mean reductions in the numbers of men engaged in research, rather than in the administrative functions. If the Senator realizes how important this matter is, I am sure he will support the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. Will the Chair advise the Senate how much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has 30 minutes remaining, and the opponents to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia have 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. NEELY. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, on Monday, when speaking on the floor, I gave my views in regard to this appropriation. Since that time I have had a unique experience. As a member of the Kefauver investigating committee, now the O'Connor committee, I was assigned to visit the United States Public Health Institute for Narcotics at Lexington, Ky., and I made that visit the day before yesterday. Let me say that if the other Members of the Senate had had the privilege of seeing what I saw in the course of that visit they would vote to recommit this particular appropriation bill. If Senators could have seen the 208 teen-age youngsters who were in that institution, whereas only 2 years ago there were only 3 young people there—in other words, a jump from 3 to 208 in 2 years—and if all Senators could have heard those youngsters tell their stories and state how they became addicted to the use of narcotic drugs, and if Senators then could have seen all the evidences of the wonderful work the Public Health physicians are doing in that institution in restoring those young people to society and reclaiming their lives and making them useful citizens again, I repeat, that every Member of this body would vote to recommit this particular appropriation bill.

I thank the Senator from West Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. HUNT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Wyoming realize that the cuts here made will not affect the work to which he has referred?

Mr. HUNT. No; I do not realize it. I do not realize it because three of these doctors are doing purely research work, and, as I understand, this appropriation applies to research physicians in the Public Health Service.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. WHERRY. I think we should check up on the time, in order that we may know just what time remains. My

understanding is that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has used 12 minutes of the second hour. If so, that would leave 18 minutes at the disposal of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Presiding Officer kindly tell me how much time is left of the second 30 minutes, to be controlled by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-eight minutes remain.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, my purpose in rising is not only to associate myself with the motion of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, but to support vigorously the effort he is making to have the pending bill re-committed, and to have it again reported by the committee, in accordance with the instructions incorporated in the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

I desire to say a few words regarding the question of procedure and about what could and I trust will happen. There are those who would have us believe that the recommittal motion, if it is agreed to, might delay the progress of business in the Senate. First of all, I may say that argument has little or no merit, in view of the many weeks and months which we have already spent with not too much progress, and this sudden concern over the rapidity of action by the Congress is hardly becoming to a body which has taken so long in order to get thus far. But, even more important, the motion to recommit can be acted on favorably and a bill can be reported back to the Senate within a very few moments by prompt action on the part of the committee.

I desire to emphasize, Mr. President, that there is no delay which is of substantial nature involved in the motion of the Senator from West Virginia. Let me document my argument with a very recent experience. I understand the independent offices appropriation bill made an untimely entrance into this Chamber, and in no uncertain words it was sent scooting back to committee, with instructions to take off 10 percent. Within a very short time the bill was returned, with the 10-percent clip having been well performed. The cutting operation, if not successful, and even though the patient may die, was, from a surgical point of view, at least, accomplished. I submit, therefore, that the bill can be re-committed in this instance without undue delay resulting, and that it ought to be re-committed.

Mr. President, how much money is involved in these appropriations? Apparently there is a deep and abiding concern about checkbooks, about cash in the bank, and about dollars. As the Senator from West Virginia intimated, even though he did not say it, there are no checking accounts either in

heaven or in hell. As the saying goes, "You cannot take it with you." I understand it is the purpose of man on this earth to try to better his life at least a little bit within the pattern of ethics laid down in the Old and New Testaments.

Mr. President, how much money is involved? Are we talking about subsidizing some great research program to the extent of \$2,000,000,000, as we did in connection with atomic research? Are we talking about the kind of appropriation which went scooting through the Congress for a hydrogen bomb, without even as much as an argument? It was all hush-hush. We had to have that right away. We had to appropriate the money right away. I voted for the appropriation. I was told it was vital to the security of the United States. But that involved hundreds of millions of dollars, Mr. President; and, by the way, those in charge of the project are not even sure that they can make it work, they are not even sure of that; but at least we took the chance, and I did not hear one economizer say, "Now, take it easy, let us ease into this thing, let us not be jumping into this uncertain field of scientific endeavor." But we had to do it, because it was important to the welfare of the American community, the American Nation, to its people, and to the free world.

How much money is involved in the proposal of the Senator from West Virginia? Frankly, I think he has been very timid. I think he has not gone far enough. But I think he has used prudent judgment in saying this may be as far as we should go, in view of the temper of the Senate. The amount is slightly over \$1,000,000. I wish to repeat that figure, because the American people have heard other figures so frequently that it may have slipped by without proper notice. I am talking about \$1,000,000-plus, a little over \$1,000,000. For what? Is it \$1,000,000 to be used for the purpose of destroying something? Oh, no; it is \$1,000,000 to be used to save life; \$1,000,000, as the Senator from West Virginia so eloquently and with such deep sincerity said, to relieve the agonizing suffering of people who are victims of cancer, multiple sclerosis, nervous disorder, heart disease, arthritis, and the many other diseases which are included in the field covered by the National Health Institutes.

Is there a United States Senator, or is there anyone who aspires to come to this body, or anyone who has left this body, who can tell me that the United States of America cannot afford an extra \$1,000,000 to alleviate the suffering of its own people? As a matter of fact, the Senate of the United States could save a good portion of that sum, if it wanted to, merely by limiting certain of its activities. It should be done. Do not tell me that we cannot afford \$1,000,000 for heart and mental health and for cancer research.

Mr. President, there is not one logical argument against the proposal of the Senator from West Virginia—not one. There is not a Member of the Senate who can say that the country cannot afford the appropriations which would be pro-

vided if the motion were agreed to. There is no man who can say a recommitment of the bill would unduly delay the progress of business in this body. There is no one who can say that the programs affected are not well-thought-out, constructive programs, which have had a great history of experience. If this were a case to be tried in court, where justice was to be done, there is not a judge in the whole country who would not give an unqualified decision in favor of the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Let me make another observation regarding the health programs. Every time we have under consideration in this body a measure connected with the national defense, we have literally a struggle here to see which one of us will be recognized first, to prove that we are for it. In other words, Senators almost literally jump out of their chairs to say "Mr. President," because they want to be on record for the great appropriations for the national defense. There is not one of us who wants to go back home and have someone point at us and say, "How does it come you did not vote for enough airplanes or enough guns?" I am sure that all of us want to be within the category of devoted, patriotic citizens, who are concerned about the national security; but, Mr. President, one weakness of our country, one limitation, is manpower. We have the scientific know-how. We have the greatest industrial machine the world has ever known, but we are outnumbered in this world; and one of the real problems for the selective service, one of the real problems for our defense industries, and one of the real problems, as we face 800,000,000 slaves of the Soviet Union, is the problem of manpower. So what does the Senate do? It says, "Well, we are just going to shave off a little bit more of that manpower; we are going to reduce the funds for research."

I say that, Mr. President, because it is impossible to conduct research without people, and, when we reduce personnel, as the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] said, and, as the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] said, the result is to cut down on research work.

No, Mr. President, this country can ill afford to cut down on research which will save the lives of men, women, and children. We need to save our manpower and our human resources, and I believe it is fair to say—and anyone who has studied the subject will understand it, I think—that the problem of mental health is one of the Nation's foremost problems.

What is the problem of mental health? Does it involve the building of more sanatoriums, the erection of more buildings? Not at all, Mr. President. The problem is that of training competent staffs. We are able to put together bricks and mortar, to erect buildings, and to create large institutions, but we have not the trained personnel to put into them. So what does the Senate do, by the Ferguson amendment? The Senate says, "Go ahead, create, and build some buildings; we did not trim down the hospital construction. Go

ahead and build the buildings, but do not train any doctors to put inside of them." I submit, Mr. President, that is not sound public policy.

Furthermore, let me make a general comment on the defense of our country. I appreciate the sudden increase in attendance in this body, but I wish Senators would listen, because we might change a vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The defense of this country is not to be found in military equipment alone; it is to be found in the utilization of its total resources, its industrial resources, its military resources, and its human resources. What the Senator from West Virginia is pleading for this afternoon is that we place just a little emphasis upon the human resources and the care of our most precious resources, namely, the human mind, the human body, and the human soul.

Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield me a little more time?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I yield all my remaining time to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not need it all. I appreciate the generosity of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, I wish to emphasize the point I was making. Why are we putting up this struggle to have the bill recommitted? The Senator from West Virginia is fearful that he may not be successful. Let me address some remarks to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], whose heart and whose spirit in connection with these measures are second to none. I have appeared before the subcommittee, and I know the friendly manner in which he received testimony and how he feels toward humanitarian programs. In case the motion to recommit does not succeed, there will be a chance to do something for the country in the conference committee, because it can bring back a report which will accomplish the objectives which the Senator from West Virginia has outlined.

Mr. President, let me make a few general remarks about the Ferguson amendment and what its result would be, because I realize that the motion of the Senator from West Virginia does not go so far in terms of restoring funds as the Ferguson amendment would diminish them. Therefore, I want to comment on one or two other phases of the question.

It so happens that in the pending Labor and Federal Security Agency appropriation bill there are such items as research in tuberculosis, venereal diseases, communicable disease, sanitation; and all these have been affected—every one of them—by the Ferguson amendment. The committee recommended appropriations which were less than the budget estimates, and yet every single one of these projects which I have mentioned has been affected by the cut as outlined in the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The subcommittee, headed by the distinguished Senator from

New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], reported the bill to the full committee with the restoration of the full budget items in these different particulars.

If the Senator from Minnesota will yield further to me, let me say, with reference to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, that he finds himself in a position which I am sure is most painful to him. He has a particular responsibility as the chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in charge of this bill. He is not free as is an individual Senator to act in a matter of this kind; he has the responsibility of the chairmanship of the subcommittee representing the full committee which reported the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand.

Mr. HILL. I desire to say again, as I tried to say on Friday afternoon, that there is no Member of the Congress, in either the Senate or the House, who has worked harder or labored more earnestly to get the funds necessary to carry forward these great health programs than has the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico. I can bear witness, as a member of his subcommittee, that he has spent days, weeks, and months attending hearings, endeavoring to marshal and to bring forth the strongest possible testimony to sustain and support the carrying forward of these great programs.

I again pay my tribute to him for his many devoted and valued efforts not only in connection with this bill, but throughout the year, in behalf of these great health programs. There is no Member of the Congress of the United States who is filled with a deeper sense of humanity than is the Senator from New Mexico. He is, in truth, one of our great humanitarians.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Alabama, and I concur in his remarks concerning the chairman of the subcommittee.

I just put into the RECORD the fact that for the National Institutes of Health there was recommended in the bill an appropriation of \$240,027 under the budget estimate. This, in turn, has been cut another 5 percent.

For the National Cancer Institute there was recommended an appropriation of \$141,829 under the budget estimate. That has, in turn, been cut another 5 percent.

For the mental-health activities there was recommended an appropriation of \$62,026 under the budget estimate. That has been cut another 5 percent.

The National Heart Institute's appropriation was \$77,018 under the budget estimate. It has, in turn, been cut another 5 percent. And so on down the line, Mr. President.

If we are going to start an economy movement in the Congress, it seems to me we should start it somewhere else than in appropriations affecting human life.

What else has been the effect of this over-all cut? I invite the attention of the Senate, and I do it only as a warning, because of my responsibility as chairman of a subcommittee dealing with

labor-management relationships, to what is going to happen. At least, I think it is fair to prophesy that it will happen.

The National Labor Relations Board, which is responsible for the administration of the Labor Relations Act of 1947, has been severely impaired by this 5-percent cut. The National Labor Relations Board handles 1,900 labor-relations cases a month, and this cut will mean that at least a thousand cases will not be handled and processed.

I submit, Mr. President, that during a period of defense we need labor-management peace. What we have done has been to cut off a piece of the machinery that can give us some peace.

I also desire to point out, Mr. President, that the same thing has happened in connection with the National Mediation Service. I am familiar with the activities of that splendid agency of the Government. Its appropriation, like others in this appropriation bill, as it was reported to the Senate, was far below the budget estimate, namely, \$200,000 below it. Another 5 percent has been taken off personnel. We do not settle labor-management disputes by documents; we settle them by personnel. I have been informed that a 5 percent cut will severely handicap the operations of these two agencies, both of which are vital defense agencies. They are working hand in hand with the Wage Stabilization Board. Both of them are assigned the responsibility of working out a program of labor-management peace and harmony in our defense industries, and it seems to me that, in view of the tremendous responsibility which faces us with respect to production and a full flow of production, it is false economy of the worst kind to try to cut the appropriation of these two agencies of the Government, particularly when the committee's recommended appropriation was far below the budget estimate.

The National Labor Relations Board, before the Ferguson amendment, had a decrease in its budget allowance of \$348,541. I submit, Mr. President, as chairman of the Labor-Management Relations Subcommittee, where we have discussed the work of the National Labor Relations Board, that it is fair to say that every member of the committee concurs in my judgment that instead of its being overstaffed, instead of its being able to complete its work on schedule, it is understaffed and will be severely impaired in its operations by the 5-percent cut.

So, Mr. President, if there ever was a need to send a bill back to committee, that need has been demonstrated all the way from the Bureau of Education down the line.

Mr. President, I conclude by urging upon this body that it act favorably on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia, and that we give the people of the United States an opportunity to be adequately served by their Government particularly in the fields of health, which are so vital.

At a later time, Mr. President, because of the reductions, I think we shall be

confronted with the situation of having presented to us a deficiency appropriation bill.

By the way, let me speak on that subject for a moment. I just mentioned the word "deficiency." Every time we try to bring about a little efficiency, every time some Member endeavors to bring about efficiency, do Senators know what happens? A deficiency appropriation bill is sneaked in through the back door. But what receives the headlines is the original move for economy. That is what receives the headlines. The very first appropriation bill the Congress voted for this year was a deficiency appropriation bill providing several hundred million dollars. What does deficiency mean? It means that something goes wrong, and that a little later we will have to change our minds with respect to economy and say, "Very well, we have changed our minds." We will pick up the tab.

If that is the procedure to be followed, it is all very well with me; but I should like to be let in on the secret. If this is not a sincere effort to cut, I should like to be told, because I submit that when research projects are underway, and a research experiment is within 10 points of being completed, Congress is not going to stop it. Why do we not face up to the problem honorably, and tell the American people that we are willing to appropriate the money needed to do the job on schedule, instead of having to dismiss personnel and then rehire them. There is no business in the world that has so many dismissals and as many rehiring as has the Government of the United States. There is only one reason for it. It is because the Congress of the United States, in its appropriations, does not properly give due credence to the requirements of the various agencies.

Mr. President, I ask support for the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me for 4 minutes?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I listened with interest to the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. Of course, those who are for economy must attempt to economize at some place. As bills come along for action by the Senate, if the Senator from Minnesota continues to object so strongly to certain cuts being made, I hope he will endeavor to find places in the budget where he can support the economy effort.

Mr. President, many of the remarks which have been made on the floor have a good deal of merit. Many Senators who are opposed to recommitment of the bill have just as much human interest in the projects sponsored by the various health groups as has any other Member of the Senate. It was my privi-

lege to initiate the original appropriation for heart research in the Congress of the United States, and I have actively supported such activities as the National Heart Institute and other worthy activities and projects covered by this item of the bill.

When Senators speak of the terrible effect of the additional 5 percent cut, I call to their attention that actually it is a cut of less than 1 percent. Contained in these appropriations is a total of \$102,089,739. If the 5-percent cut carried by the Ferguson amendment remains, it will mean that the agencies will still receive \$101,157,675, which represents a cut of less than 1 percent. Any agency of the Federal Government that cannot absorb a cut of less than 1 percent certainly should go out of business. It is not going to ruin anybody or anything for the Senate of the United States to stand by the figures as represented by the cuts.

So far as I am concerned, I do not like to hear statements endeavoring to place on Members of the United States Senate the onus of being against the Health Institutes or any other similar activities simply because they are in favor of retaining the Ferguson amendment, which provides a cut of less than 1 percent. If the amendment meant cutting the heart out of a needed appropriation, it would be wholly different. But it does not mean that.

In order that the figures may be cleared up, Mr. President, I ask that, as a part of my remarks, the exact appropriations, the exact effects of the 5-percent cut, and the amounts available to the departments, may be placed in the RECORD at this point, so that we will have the facts before us, and not generalities inferring that we are making tremendous cuts.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Effect of Neely motion to recommit

Item	Committee recommendation	5-percent cut in personal services by Ferguson amendment	Available after Ferguson amendment
National Cancer Institute.....	\$19,805,171	\$141,830	\$19,663,341
Mental health activities.....	10,737,974	62,026	10,675,948
Tuberculosis.....	8,887,351	112,649	8,774,702
Venereal diseases.....	11,653,360	146,640	11,506,720
Dental health activities.....	1,697,308	52,692	1,644,616
National Heart Institute.....	10,072,982	77,018	9,995,964
National Health Institutes.....	15,559,973	240,027	15,319,946
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation:			
Payments to States.....	21,500,000	4,597	21,495,403
Salaries and expenses.....	675,620	29,380	646,240
Children's Bureau: Salaries and expenses.....	1,500,000	65,205	1,434,795
Total.....	102,089,739	932,064	101,157,675

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not sure of my ground on this point, and therefore I

am asking the Senator from New Hampshire a question. Is it not a fact that last year the Senator from New Hampshire joined the Senator from New York and his associates in introducing a bill asking for about \$60,000,000 more for cancer research, heart research, mental health research, dental care, and other collateral and similar activities?

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to tell the Senator that I did, but frankly I do not think I did. I would not say positively, however. I have always supported similar programs. But now the Senate has attempted to bring about an economy program, to make cuts. I do not believe the cuts proposed to be made are going to bear serious consequences, because they will affect only subordinate personnel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Hampshire has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I now yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, first, I desire to compliment the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and those who have argued on his side, for their humanitarian sentiments. I realize that the atmosphere of today's Senate session is choked with emotion. I wish to say, however, that the mere fact that we have proposed a 5-percent cut in the personnel below the budget figure is not an attempt to destroy or cripple or in any way harm the health programs. There is no one who would not give dollars to cure the ills of man. But the appropriation of millions of dollars does not mean that the problems will be solved. It takes time, it takes the intelligent study under programs properly supervised, not loosely thrown together, to solve the problems.

Certain problems cannot be solved, no matter how many persons may be placed on the job this year or next year. When I think of that I am always reminded of what General Knudsen said when he first came to Washington to take over the production program. He said, "One thing that must be learned here is that you cannot change the hatching process and get chickens any quicker by putting two hens on the nest." There is much truth in that statement.

Mr. President, referring now to the motion to recommit, is nothing but a paraphrase of the Lehman amendment which was rejected by the Senate. The amendment which was added to the bill on motion of the Senator from Michigan and other Senators does not cripple health and welfare activities. It scarcely touches them. Appropriations for the activities covered by the motion amounted, in the House bill, to \$132,875,000. The Ferguson amendment reduces them by seven-tenths of 1 percent. This comes about because these programs are mainly carried forward by grants to the States, to institutions, and to individuals for research and care. That is the way to solve these problems. They will not be solved by housing thou-

sands of employees under one supervisor. Workers must be sent to the colleges and hospitals, to the firing line where the medical men are engaged from day to day in particular forms of research in an effort to solve the problems. We cannot solve them here in Washington.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan thinks that the way to solve these research problems is to reduce by several hundred the number of highly trained scientific and research staffs which are now engaged in this work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield me a little more time?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have been as tolerant and patient as possible in giving my time to the other side. Other Senators wish to speak too.

I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the pending motion is the motion by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to recommit the bill to the committee. I trust that it will be voted down by an overwhelming majority of this body.

When I came here I thought it was my public and private duty to pursue, as best I knew how, my own convictions in the interest of my country. I also thought when I came here that perhaps this was a confraternity of gentlemen, and that every Member respected the motives of every other Member. Yet, when I came into this Chamber a little while ago, I heard myself being excoriated by the Senator from West Virginia. I heard him impugn my motives. I heard him, by implication, at least, leave the impression that there was ice water in my veins. He ought to be ashamed of himself.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I call the Senator to order. I said nothing of the kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will take his seat.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I did not yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Illinois except for the purpose of discussing the pending question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I shall discuss the pending question, Mr. President.

I remind my friend from West Virginia that when the Pepper-Neely bill relating to cancer was pending I stood in the House of Representatives and did yeoman service in behalf of my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. NEELY. If the Senator had been present, he would have known that I said that the able junior Senator from Illinois made one of the best speeches made in the Seventy-ninth Congress in behalf of my bill proposing an appropriation of \$100,000,000 for cancer research, and that I wished he would vote to get

rid of the 5-percent cut in connection with a \$19,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then why the reflection on the motives of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President—

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not yield further. Mr. NEELY. I did not reflect on the Senator's motives at all.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a minority Member, I stood up and defended the Pepper-Neely bill when most Members would not do it. I was one who initiated an amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill asking Mr. Lilienthal for \$25,000,000 out of the atomic energy funds for the pursuit of cancer research. It was cut down to \$1,000,000.

That bears out what the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] says, that we cannot get results faster by putting two hens on the same nest. So we said, "We will not take \$25,000,000; we will not take \$5,000,000; we will take \$1,000,000 and pursue the work."

There is no disposition on the part of any Senator on this side of the aisle to imperil or impair these health research programs. On the other hand, we realize that there is involved the issue of the solvency of America. I think we take a judicious course when we follow the Ferguson amendment right down the line, and make no exceptions. We cannot hurry the program any faster merely by spending more money. All the work being done in the field of private research will continue as it has continued in the past. All the work being done at the State level will continue. All the work being done in American universities will continue. We seek only to get at the over-staffing of Government. So I hope that the motion to recommit will be voted down with gusto.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Mexico would like to ask the Senator from West Virginia a question.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have only 6 minutes left. I do not know under what mistaken impression some other Senator may speak. My point was that in view of the fact that the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois so enthusiastically supported my bill for \$100,000,000 for cancer research in the Seventy-ninth Congress while he was a Member of the House, I was wondering how he could now vote to reduce an appropriation of \$19,000,000 for the very same kind of service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized. He has 6 minutes remaining; and the Senator from West Virginia has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to hear every Senator express his opinion. I yield out of my time to the Senator from New York—

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have expressed my opinion, so I do not wish to impose on the Senator's generosity.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New York,

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I asked the distinguished Senator from New

Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] whether or not he was one of the group which recommended \$60,000,000 for research work. The reason I asked that question was that I was not sure whether his name was on the bill or not. I believe it was. I do know that he was a member of our group. I do know that his sympathies and support were on the side of the request for \$60,000,000. If \$60,000,000 more was necessary last year, I wonder why this year he feels that it is justifiable to knock out \$60,000,000 and, in addition, cut the appropriation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. To me it does not make very sound sense.

So far as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is concerned, he talked about our not being able to use a great deal more money. We are not asking for any more money. We are asking to be given the same amount which is estimated by the Budget Bureau, without reducing personnel. By no stretch of the imagination can anyone question the fact that by the cut provided by the Ferguson amendment our research staffs, our technical staffs, and our staffs of great scientists will be reduced by many hundreds in the various services.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not necessary to reduce the number of scientists. The reductions in personnel can be made in the various lower grades of clerks, and so forth. The scientists can still work under the provisions of the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I answer the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I yield an additional minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I showed in my remarks on several occasions that the administrative staff in all this work was less than 3 percent of the entire roster of employees. We cannot cut to any extent from the minimum figure of 8 percent. So those who would be laid off would be scientists and research workers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am opposing the motion of my good friend from West Virginia, but not for the reasons outlined by the Senator from Illinois. The cuts brought about by the Ferguson amendment will reduce the items in the public health branch of the bill by \$932,064. I do not believe that adding that much to the bill would in any way involve the solvency of our Nation.

I am opposing the motion of the Senator from West Virginia not because I am not interested in the items which he has so ably discussed, but because I am afraid that the longer the passage of the bill is delayed the more chance there is that there will be worse damage done to it than has been done to it by the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from New Mexico will recall that about 3 or 4 days ago I addressed a question to him with respect to how he justified the 5-percent cut which the committee was willing to make, and then I asked him with respect to the 10-percent cut, and he said that he was opposed to a 10-percent cut because such a cut would render the whole program ineffective.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And I so voted.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. If the Senator takes that position as a fundamental fact, how can he oppose the motion of the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New Mexico is only 1 of 96 Senators. Fifty-six Senators voted contrary to the views of the Senator from New Mexico. Therefore I am afraid that there will be more damage done by sending the bill back to committee than otherwise. I am willing to take the chance that there may be some charity in the House conferees and that they will reinstate the Senate figures.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator from New Mexico still believe that a 10-percent cut would render the entire program ineffective?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not necessarily, and I will tell the Senator why I believe so. I thought that a 5-percent cut was sounder than a 10-percent cut. However, the 10-percent cut goes to the budget figures. The Senator from Rhode Island has been in public life long enough, both in his home State and in the Federal service, to know that when departments submit figures to the Bureau of the Budget the requests usually contain at least a 10-percent cushion, which the departments do not know whether Congress will reduce. Therefore I do not believe they would be hurt by a 10-percent cut. Naturally they will be hurt more than by a 5-percent cut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. NEELY. If no other Senator wishes to take time I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall not use all the time remaining. However, there are one or two points which I should like to clarify, because there seems to be some misunderstanding with respect to the statistics which have been presented to the Senate.

First of all, if I heard correctly, I understood the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] to say that what was involved was less than a 1-percent cut. Percentage figures are always very interesting. To be sure, all that is involved is less than a 1-percent cut on the total appropriations carried by the bill; but I repeat there is involved a 5-percent cut on personal services on the items which the Senator from West Virginia has mentioned. A 5-percent cut is involved on the personal serv-

ices in research for cancer, mental health, dental activities, arteriosclerosis, arthritis, and the other Health Institute services.

Let no one say that any department that cannot get along with a little cut of less than 1 percent does not deserve to exist. Let no one get by with that kind of argument. What we are talking about is a 5-percent cut in trained technical personnel, and a 5-percent cut in trained technical personnel can mean the difference between the life and death of a program.

The Senator from Minnesota has just asked one of the pages to get a copy of the hearings. I have a copy of the hearings in my office with which I prepared myself for the debate. I ask any Senator to point out one line of testimony in which a doctor or professional man, either in the Government or out of the Government, said that any of the health agencies were overstaffed. If any Senator can point to one line of testimony on the part of a man of honor and integrity that the Heart Institute, for example, is overstaffed, or that the Cancer Institute is overstaffed, we have no ground for our amendment.

What do they say, Mr. President? They pleaded day in and day out, in hundreds of pages of testimony, not for what they got from the committee, but for more. The committee cut down even the budget estimates. They were able to persuade the subcommittee, which took the time to listen to hours of testimony. They were able to persuade the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. CHAVEZ], who recommended to the full committee more money than was finally recommended to the Senate by the full committee.

Mr. President, I say that if I had to base my judgment with respect to the funds which are needed for heart research either on the testimony of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], or the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], on the one hand, or that of Dr. Van Slyke, one of the most eminent heart specialists in the country, I would take the doctor's judgment. I believe doctors know more about heart research and needs for trained personnel than Senators know about such subjects. That is why witnesses were called to appear before the committee. Not one doctor testified that sufficient money was available or that a sufficient number of trained personnel was available. Our problem has been lack of trained personnel, a lack of trained doctors, dentists, and nurses. That is our problem.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator from Minnesota recall, since he has been a Member of the Senate, any official of any department coming before the Appropriations Committee and telling it that the department was overstaffed and should be cut?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. But the Senator from Minnesota does recall that

when funds were suggested by Senators on the floor of the Senate with respect to certain agencies only a year ago, one of the eminent members of either the Heart or Cancer Institute said they could use only so much money at the time and asked that they not be given as much as we wanted to give them. Therefore, we reduced our suggestions and came in with the amount that we could honorably support on the basis of professional evidence.

Mr. President, I merely wish to point out one other fact. It appears that every Senator is filled with a sincere conviction and humanitarian concern with respect to our sick people. They will express their convictions by the votes that they will cast. However, Mr. President, somewhere it is written, "By their fruits ye shall know them." It is deeds that count, not words. The measure of the concern we have will be shown by our votes. The amount of money involved is about \$1,000,000. How shall we vote on recommitment? If we vote to recommit the bill we are simply saying that 150,000,000 people cannot support another \$900,000 worth of research. Either that, or we are saying we are in favor of it, but not quite enough.

I conclude by saying that there is no evidence anywhere in the testimony to substantiate the claims which have been made by the distinguished Senators who have spoken in opposition to the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired. All time for debate has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY].

Mr. WHERRY and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. If the junior Senator from Oregon were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] is unavoidably detained on official business, and if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "nay," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent on official business, and his pair has been announced previously by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE].

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—31

Aiken	Ives	Monroney
Anderson	Johnson, Tex.	Moody
Benton	Kefauver	Neely
Clements	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kilgore	Pastore
Green	Langer	Smathers
Hayden	Lehrman	Sparkman
Hennings	Long	Tobey
Hill	Magnuson	Underwood
Humphrey	McFarland	
Hunt	McMahon	

NAYS—50

Bennett	Ferguson	Robertson
Brewster	Frear	Russell
Bricker	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Smith, Maine
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Byrd	Jenner	Smith, N. C.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Carlson	Knowland	Thye
Chavez	Maybank	Watkins
Cordon	McCarthy	Welker
Dirksen	McClellan	Wherry
Douglas	McKellar	Wiley
Duff	Mundt	Williams
Dworshak	Nixon	Young
Ecton	O'Connor	

NOT VOTING—15

Case	George	Martin
Eastland	Gillette	McCarran
Ellender	Kem	Millikin
Flanders	Lodge	Morse
Fulbright	Malone	Murray

So Mr. NEELY's motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? There are 30 minutes of time for debate remaining.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a table purporting to show the effect of the Ferguson amendment. The table has been prepared at my direction by the staff of the committee. It shows that the Ferguson amendment would reduce the total appropriation by \$4,492,071. There may well be differences of opinion as to the application of the Ferguson amendment to individual items. The table shows the maximum effect. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, 1952—Effect of Ferguson amendment

[Figures in parentheses not added in totals]

Agency and item (1)	1952 budget estimate (2)	Specific amounts in bill (3)	Budget estimate for personal serv- ices (4)	5 percent of personal serv- ices estimate (5)	Available funds after application of Ferguson amendment (3)-(5) (6)
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR					
Office of Secretary:					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$1, 475, 000	\$1, 000, 000	\$1, 315, 933	\$65, 797	\$934, 203
Salaries and expenses, Office of Solicitor.....	1, 750, 000	1, 575, 000	1, 611, 101	80, 555	1, 494, 445
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards.....	766, 000	688, 000	636, 705	31, 835	656, 165
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights.....	277, 000	265, 758	224, 845	11, 242	254, 516
Total, Office of the Secretary.....	4, 268, 000	3, 528, 758	3, 788, 584	189, 429	3, 339, 329
Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Apprenticeship.....	2, 692, 000	2, 578, 682	2, 266, 367	113, 318	2, 465, 364
Bureau of Employment Security:					
Salaries and expenses.....	5, 475, 000	5, 245, 959	4, 580, 814	229, 041	5, 016, 918
Grants to States:					
Basic appropriation.....	159, 560, 000	159, 560, 000	681, 092	34, 055	159, 525, 945
Contingency reserve.....	10, 000, 000	5, 000, 000			5, 000, 000
Bureau of Employees' Compensation:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1, 973, 000	1, 887, 816	1, 703, 683	85, 184	1, 802, 632
War claims transfer.....	(122, 000)	(122, 000)			(122, 000)
Employees' compensation fund.....	31, 000, 000	30, 000, 000			30, 000, 000
War claims transfer.....	(5, 000, 000)	(5, 000, 000)			(5, 000, 000)
Bureau of Labor Statistics:					
Salaries and expenses.....	5, 935, 000	5, 371, 352	4, 769, 216	238, 461	5, 132, 891
Revision of Consumers' Price Index.....	1, 250, 000	1, 125, 000	1, 043, 498	52, 175	1, 072, 825
Salaries and expenses, Women's Bureau.....	396, 000	379, 235	334, 296	16, 715	362, 579
Salaries and expenses, Wage and Hour Division.....	8, 740, 000	8, 365, 304	7, 493, 923	374, 696	7, 990, 608
Total, Department of Labor.....	231, 289, 000	223, 042, 156	26, 661, 473	1, 333, 074	221, 709, 082
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY					
American Printing House for the Blind.....	115, 000	115, 000			115, 000
Columbia Institution for the Deaf, salaries and expenses.....	390, 000	374, 537	309, 268	15, 463	339, 074
Food and Drug Administration:					
Salaries and expenses.....	5, 395, 000	5, 172, 975	4, 440, 500	222, 025	4, 950, 950
Certification and inspection services, salaries and expenses (special).....	(1, 049, 300)	(1, 049, 300)		(1)	(1, 049, 300)
Freedmen's Hospital, salaries and expenses.....	2, 987, 000	2, 631, 500	2, 161, 880	(1)	2, 631, 500
Howard University:					
Salaries and expenses.....	2, 575, 000	2, 415, 084	3, 198, 324	159, 916	2, 255, 168
Plans and specifications.....	55, 500	55, 500			
Construction of buildings.....	1, 236, 500	1, 236, 500			1, 236, 500
Office of Education:					
Vocational education grants (George-Barden funds).....	20, 017, 760	20, 017, 760			20, 017, 760
Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts.....	2, 430, 000	2, 430, 000			2, 430, 000
Salaries and expenses.....	3, 550, 000	3, 397, 706	3, 045, 871	152, 294	3, 245, 412
Payments to school districts.....	40, 000, 000	40, 000, 000			40, 000, 000
Grants for surveys and school construction.....	75, 000, 000	75, 000, 000			75, 000, 000
Office of Vocational Rehabilitation:					
Payments to States.....	23, 000, 000	21, 500, 000	91, 943	4, 597	21, 495, 403
Salaries and expenses.....	705, 000	675, 620	587, 600	29, 380	646, 240
Public Health Service:					
Venereal diseases.....	11, 800, 000	11, 653, 360	2, 932, 797	146, 640	11, 506, 720
Tuberculosis.....	9, 000, 000	8, 887, 351	2, 252, 972	112, 649	8, 774, 702
Assistance to States, general.....	16, 084, 000	15, 960, 000	2, 000, 994	100, 050	15, 859, 950
Communicable diseases.....	6, 150, 000	5, 915, 747	4, 635, 070	234, 254	5, 681, 493
Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene.....	3, 800, 000	3, 648, 153	3, 036, 846	151, 842	3, 496, 316
Water pollution control grants.....	1, 000, 000	900, 000			900, 000
Alaska, disease and sanitation investigations and control.....	1, 234, 000	1, 211, 129	457, 418	22, 871	1, 188, 258
Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati: Appropriation.....	2, 400, 000	2, 400, 000			2, 400, 000
Hospital construction, grants to States:					
Liquidation cash.....	120, 000, 000	100, 000, 000			100, 000, 000
Obligation cash.....	75, 000, 000	95, 000, 000			95, 000, 000
Salaries and expenses, hospital construction.....	1, 220, 000	1, 166, 465	1, 070, 700	53, 535	1, 112, 930
Hospitals and medical care.....	30, 200, 000	30, 200, 000	22, 625, 358	(1)	30, 200, 000
Foreign Quarantine Service.....	3, 000, 000	2, 868, 029	2, 639, 430	131, 972	2, 736, 057
National Institutes of Health.....	15, 800, 000	15, 559, 973	4, 800, 532	240, 027	15, 319, 946
National Cancer Institute.....	19, 947, 000	19, 805, 171	2, 836, 590	141, 830	19, 663, 341
Mental health activities.....	10, 800, 000	10, 737, 974	1, 240, 515	62, 026	10, 675, 948
National Heart Institute.....	10, 150, 000	10, 072, 982	1, 540, 351	77, 018	9, 995, 964
Dental health activities.....	1, 750, 000	1, 697, 308	1, 053, 848	52, 692	1, 644, 616
Construction of research facilities: Appropriation.....	18, 590, 000	16, 630, 540	89, 200	4, 460	16, 626, 080
Commissioned officers, pay, etc.....	1, 900, 000	1, 861, 500	770, 000	38, 500	1, 823, 000
Salaries and expenses, Public Health Service.....	2, 868, 000	2, 745, 868	2, 442, 646	122, 132	2, 623, 736
Total, Public Health Service.....	362, 693, 000	358, 921, 555	56, 475, 267	1, 692, 498	357, 229, 057
St. Elizabeths Hospital:					
Salaries and expenses.....	2, 135, 000	2, 135, 000	1, 547, 961	(1)	2, 135, 000
Miscellaneous construction and replacements.....	136, 500	136, 500			136, 500
Total, St. Elizabeths Hospital.....	2, 271, 500	2, 271, 500	1, 547, 961		2, 271, 500
Social Security Administration:					
Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation.....	200, 000	167, 650			135, 300
Annual indefinite (fees).....	(598, 000)	(598, 000)	647, 000	32, 350	(598, 000)
Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance:					
Salaries and expenses (trust fund limitation).....	(60, 000, 000)	(57, 437, 980)	(51, 260, 398)	(2, 563, 020)	(54, 874, 960)
Reimbursement to OASI trust fund.....	3, 734, 000	3, 734, 000			3, 734, 000
Bureau of Public Assistance:					
Grants (titles I, IV, X, and XIV).....	1, 300, 000, 000	1, 150, 000, 000			1, 150, 000, 000
Salaries and expenses.....	1, 698, 000	1, 600, 000	1, 532, 000	76, 600	1, 523, 400
Children's Bureau:					
Salaries and expenses.....	1, 592, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 304, 105	65, 205	1, 434, 795
Grants to States, maternal and child welfare.....	33, 000, 000	33, 000, 000			33, 000, 000
Office of Commissioner, salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation.....	233, 000	200, 000			184, 495
Transfer from OASI trust fund.....	(117, 000)	(100, 000)	810, 100	15, 505	(100, 000)
Total, Social Security Administration.....	1, 340, 457, 000	1, 190, 201, 650	3, 793, 205	189, 660	1, 190, 011, 990

Footnotes at end of table.

Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, 1952—Effect of Ferguson amendment—Continued

[Figures in parentheses not added in totals]

Agency and item (1)	1952 budget estimate (2)	Specific amounts in bill (3)	Budget estimate for personal serv- ices (4)	5 percent of personal serv- ices estimate (5)	Available funds after application of Ferguson amendment (3)-(5) (6)
FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY—continued					
Office of Administrator:					
Salaries, Office of Administrator:	\$2,419,000	\$2,150,000	\$2,832,000	\$121,600	\$2,028,400
Appropriation.....	(413,000)	(413,000)			
Transfer from OASI.....					
Service operations, salaries and expenses:					
Appropriation.....	780,000	711,500	423,205	18,160	693,340
Transfer from OASI.....	(135,000)	(123,500)			
General Counsel, salaries:					
Appropriation.....	427,000	396,478	850,444	22,522	373,956
Transfers (Food and Drug and OASI).....	(423,950)	(411,950)			
Surplus property disposal and utilization.....	333,000	75,000	276,893	(1)	75,000
Total, Office of Administrator.....	3,959,000	3,332,978	4,382,542	162,282	3,170,696
Total, Federal Security Agency.....	² 1,888,574,210	1,729,799,865	80,034,361	2,623,115	1,727,171,750
National Labor Relations Board, salaries and expenses.....	8,582,500	8,233,959	6,970,825	348,541	7,885,418
National Mediation Board:					
Salaries and expenses.....	410,000	394,247	315,060	15,753	378,494
Arbitration and emergency boards.....	150,000	144,000	120,000	6,000	138,000
National Railroad Adjustment Board, salaries and expenses.....	638,000	600,000	485,025	24,251	575,749
Total, National Mediation Board.....	1,198,000	1,138,247	920,085	46,004	1,092,243
Railroad retirement appropriated account.....	613,000,000	562,534,409			562,534,409
Salaries and expenses (transfer from railroad retirement trust fund).....	(5,268,000)	(5,056,904)	(4,221,916)	(211,096)	(4,845,808)
Total, Railroad Retirement Board.....	613,000,000	562,534,409			562,534,409
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service:					
Salaries and expenses.....	3,247,000	3,047,000	2,701,740	135,087	2,911,913
Boards of inquiry.....	50,000	48,750	25,000	1,250	47,500
Total, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.....	3,297,000	3,095,750	2,726,740	136,337	2,959,413
Grand total, all appropriations.....	² 2,745,940,710	2,527,844,386	117,313,484	4,492,071	2,523,352,315

¹ Not applicable.² Includes \$1,686,950 in transfer and fees.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that, without further debate, the Senate proceed to vote on the final passage of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. That requires unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I submit it is in order to vote upon final passage of the bill; is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that it is not in order to vote upon the final passage of the bill at this time, by reason of the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, then, that consent for further time for debate on the bill be withdrawn, and that the Senate now proceed to vote upon final passage of the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question is, Shall the bill pass? [Putting the question.]

The bill (H. R. 3709) was passed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HILL, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. THYE, and Mr. ECTON conferees on the part of the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3880, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is on the calendar. The clerk will read the bill by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR ON TUESDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to make a unanimous-consent request regarding the call of the calendar. We had thought that tomorrow we could at least have an explanation of the bill which has just been made the unfinished business of the Senate, and could dispose of the committee amendments, or non-controversial amendments. I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, beginning at 12 o'clock, we have a call of the Consent Calendar, from the beginning of the calendar, for the consideration

of measures to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may we have order? I could not hear what the distinguished majority leader said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Will the majority leader please restate his request?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that next Tuesday, June 19, beginning at 12 o'clock, the Senate proceed with a call of the calendar for the consideration of uncontested bills.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Do I correctly understand that the independent offices appropriation bill has been made the unfinished business of the Senate, and that it is to be considered tomorrow and Monday?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. In the event we do not finish it on Monday, is it intended that we shall lay it aside temporarily in order that there may be a call of the calendar?

Mr. McFARLAND. It would be laid aside temporarily for the call of the calendar, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. I merely wanted to have the RECORD clear.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator

the provisions, but I understand now corrections have been made which will meet the objections previously voiced by both the Treasury and myself in respect to the passage of this measure.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, all of the Senate amendments are in accord with the general principles of the bill as it passed the House. The first Senate amendment is a technical change which includes a reference to section 811 (d)—relating to revocable transfers—in the estate-tax provisions of the bill. The second amendment merely makes it clear that the bill does not tax the complete release of a power of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942. The third amendment extends from July 1, 1951, to November 1, 1951, the period during which holders of preexisting powers may make partial releases of these powers without being subjected to estate or gift tax upon the subsequent exercise of the limited powers. This amendment is desirable in order to give the holders of these old powers an opportunity to study them in the light of this new legislation. The fourth Senate amendment permits the release without gift tax of a power created after October 21, 1942, if the release occurred before June 1 of this year. This amendment was necessary in order to prevent retroactive application of the gift tax in the case of such releases.

The fifth Senate amendment exempts from estate and gift tax the lapse of a power of appointment during life to the extent, in each year, of \$5,000 or 5 percent of the property out of which the powers could have been satisfied, whichever is the greater. The House bill completely exempted the lapse of a power, but the more limited exemption in the Senate bill will be sufficient to take care of the common type of annual, noncumulative powers to invade which the provision in the House bill was designed to exempt.

The period for tax-free release of powers of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942, expires, under present law, at the close of this month. It is, therefore, very important that this bill—H. R. 2084—be enacted as promptly as possible in order to clarify the situation with respect to these old powers. For this reason, and because the bill as amended by the Senate contains essentially the same provisions as the bill which passed the House, I ask that we concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], who will further explain the Senate amendments.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, five amendments were placed on this bill in the Senate. Three of them are technical. One of the amendments placed a limitation on invasion trusts, namely, a limitation of \$5,000 or 5 percent on invasions, whichever is the larger. I think that meets the main objection the gentleman from Pennsylvania had to the bill.

May I say that this meets with the views of the Treasury, and they have given their approval to this amendment.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, the invasion which the gentleman is

speaking of is the invasion of the corpus of the trust?

Mr. CAMP. The encroachment on the corpus of the trust estate. That has been limited in this Senate amendment to \$5,000 per year or 5 percent of the trust, whichever may be larger.

Mr. EBERHARTER. In other words, if 5 percent of the trust estate is more than the \$5,000, it would be limited to 5 percent in any 1 year?

Mr. CAMP. Yes.

The other amendment was increasing the time when powers of appointment may be withdrawn in gifts or deeds made prior to 1942, giving them instead of a limitation of July 1, 1951, a limitation of December 31; that is, giving them from now until then to make those corrections in deeds, gifts, or wills as we have been discussing here.

Mr. EBERHARTER. They have until December 31 of this year?

Mr. CAMP. That is right.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I am delighted that the other body has seen fit to make these amendments, and I certainly have no objection to the adoption of the amendments.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EBERHARTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The amendments which the other body adopted and which the gentleman from Georgia has explained are actually amendments which the gentleman from Pennsylvania would have desired in the bill in the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I thank the gentleman, and withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection, but I would like to insert my explanation of those amendments, if I may, at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join with the chairman in requesting that the House concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 2084) relating to the treatment of powers of appointment for estate and gift tax purposes. It is of the utmost importance that this bill be enacted into law as promptly as possible because the period contained in the present law for the tax-free release of powers of appointment created on or before October 21, 1942, expires on the 30th of this month.

I believe the Senate amendments to this bill should be adopted. The first and second amendments by the Senate merely carry out the intent of the House bill by including a reference to section 811 (d) of the code and by specifically providing that the complete release of a preexisting power at any time is not taxable. In extending to November 1 of this year the period during which persons holding preexisting powers may release them partially without subsequent estate or gift tax liability, the Senate has taken cognizance of the fact that the holders of these powers created on or before October 21, 1942, need a short pe-

riod of time after enactment of this bill in which to make a proper disposition of these powers. A further amendment by the Senate prevents the retroactive imposition of the gift tax in the case of powers created after October 21, 1942, which were released before June 1 of this year.

The Senate amendments also limit the exemption of powers which lapse during the life of the holder to \$5,000 or 5 percent in each year. While this provision is not as liberal as the provision contained in the House bill, it will exempt the noncumulative invasion powers with which our committee was concerned. Consequently, I recommend that the House concur in the Senate amendments to this bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendments will be printed in the Record at the proper place.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUR PRODUCTS LABELING ACT

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2321) to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BECKWORTH, PRIEST, HARRIS, WOLVERTON, and O'HARA.

(Mr. DOUGHTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks on the Senate amendments to the bill H. R. 2084.)

AMENDING DISPLACED PERSONS ACT OF 1948

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3576) to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended, with an amendment of the Senate thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after line 4 over to and including line 15 on page 2 and insert: "Sec. 3 (a) I. During the three and one-half fiscal years beginning July 1, 1948, and ending December 31, 1951, eligible displaced persons and persons defined in subdivisions (2), (3), and (4) of subsection (b) of this section seeking to enter the United States as immigrants, and

"II. During the four fiscal years beginning July 1, 1948, and ending June 30, 1952, eligible displaced orphans seeking to enter the United States as immigrants may be issued immigration visas without regard to quota limitations for those years as provided by subsection (c) of this section: *Provided*,

That not more than 341,000 such visas shall be issued under this act, as amended, including such visas heretofore issued under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948: *Provided further*, That no such immigration visa shall be issued to eligible displaced persons unless the Commission initiated the selection or processing of such persons on or before July 31, 1951; and it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to procure the cooperation of other nations, particularly the members of the International Refugee Organization, in the solution of the displaced-persons problem by their accepting for resettlement a relative number of displaced persons, and to expedite the closing of the camps and terminate the emergency."

Mr. WALTER (interrupting the reading of the Senate amendment). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the amendment that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. FELLOWS] talked to me about and which he said was satisfactory to him?

Mr. WALTER. I suppose it is. All the amendment does is to change the terminal date for issuance of visas to displaced orphans so that the terminal date is the same as the date for other orphans under existing law.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the final passage of this act, I wish to convey to the House certain information regarding the present status of the displaced-persons program.

I am informed that up to June 15, 1951, 243,702 displaced persons have been admitted to the United States. In addition, again as of June 15, 1951, visas were issued to 360 out of the 2,000 persons classified as the Venezia Giulia refugees; 893 visas were issued to displaced orphans defined in section 2 (e) of the existing law; and 220 visas were granted to war orphans adopted by American citizens under section 2 (f) of the act.

I do not want to discuss at this time the activities of the agencies charged with the administration of the act, but I cannot refrain from pointing out that the processing of immigrants classified as "persons of German ethnic origin" who are authorized to come to this country under section 12 of the act has been unfortunately very slow. While 10,190 immigrants of this category have entered the United States between July 1948 and July 1950, only 752 such immigrants reached our country between July 1950 and June 15, 1951. Compare these figures, please, with the total number of persons authorized to enter this country under section 12 of the act, which is 54,744, and bear in mind that this authorization expires on June 30, 1952.

I believe that I am expressing the unanimous sentiment of the Congress in urging all three agencies involved—the Department of State, the Department of Justice, and the Displaced Persons Commission—to make every possible effort in order to comply with congressional intent by expediting the processing of this category of immigrants, without, of course, relaxing any of the statutory requirements for admission.

Having now spent over 4½ years watching the social, political, and legal aspects of this problem, I am happy to be able to advise my colleagues that the passage of the 1948 act, its amendment of June 16, 1950, and the amendment now before us, will permit the United States fully to discharge its voluntarily assumed moral obligations toward the displaced populations of Europe. I am also happy to report that the International Refugee Organization has now finally decided to finish its work and to terminate its existence on December 31 of this year. The problem of the displaced persons in Europe, as we first met it back in 1945, right after VE-day, could be safely regarded as liquidated.

However, there is a much larger problem, namely, that of the 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 refugees of German ethnic origin who have been forcibly ejected from their homes by the Communist-dominated governments of Eastern Europe. In addition, there is the problem of surplus population plaguing economically and causing political and social disturbances in at least three more European countries in addition to Western Germany, namely, in Italy, Greece, and the Netherlands.

The existence of this problem is reflected in the most disturbing pressure on our immigration system. The steadily increasing number of people who try to enter the United States illegally or by posing as temporary visitors while they are actually immigrants; the rapidly mounting number of private bills introduced in the House and in the other body; and the constant lobbying of certain groups in behalf of legislation to increase our immigration quotas—those are only a few of the occurrences facing us every day.

The Congress was well aware of this situation when it enacted into the law section 16 of the Displaced Persons Act. Under this section, the Government of the United States was authorized to participate in a conference between affected nations for the purpose of studying and making recommendations which would provide for a satisfactory solution of these problems.

I am sorry to report that very little, if anything, has been done in order to implement the clearly stated Congressional intent. Similarly, very little, if anything, has been done to implement recommendations made in House Report No. 1841, Eighty-first Congress, submitted by a special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee, of which I was the chairman. This lack of activity has produced—among other things—a highly unsatisfactory situation regarding the future operation of a whole fleet of reconditioned passenger vessels operated now by the International Refugee Organization for the purpose of shipping immigrants to this country, to Canada, to Australia, to certain countries of Central and South America, and to Africa. This extremely useful fleet which could be used for the purposes envisaged in section 16 of the Displaced Persons Act, will have to be disbanded and the vessels put in moth balls on the expiration date

of the IRO, which is only slightly over 6 months away.

Faced with the increased pressure on our immigration system and aware of the heavy burden placed by surplus populations on the economies of countries which we are assisting at great expense, we should not permit that this excellent instrument of moving people to places where they are wanted, be destroyed.

It is perfectly clear that section 16 of the Displaced Persons Act gives the Government of the United States sufficient authority to call upon all interested nations, both those who are faced with surplus and homeless populations as well as those who are ready and willing to receive them, to get together as soon as possible and to devise ways and means of continuing the good job that the International Refugee Organization has done in moving in excess of 900,000 people within the last few years. Exactly 1 year has elapsed now since section 16 became law and I most sincerely hope that the Department of State and the Economic Cooperation Administration join forces with other free nations and work toward a solution of a problem in which at least 21 nations of the world are vitally interested.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. SCHWABE. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Rhode Island if it is not a fact that the amendments consist chiefly of increases in the figures over the bill as it passed the House.

Mr. FOGARTY. It does show an increase over the House figures.

Mr. SCHWABE. Do you know approximately how much, in toto?

Mr. FOGARTY. In the neighborhood of over \$30,000,000, excluding consideration of the railroad retirement fund.

Mr. SCHWABE. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. FOGARTY, Mr. HED-

RICK, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. DENTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SCHWABE, Mr. STOCKMAN, and Mr. BUSBEY.

UNITED STATES v. JOSEPH P. KAMP

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on June 25, 1951, at 1:30 p. m., in the case of the United States against Joseph P. Kamp, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES v. JOSEPH P. KAMP, No. 1788-50.

The President of the United States to Hon. Clyde Doyle, United States Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, June 25, 1951 at 1:30 o'clock p. m., to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or District Attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 22d day of June A. D. 1951.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, Clerk

By MICHAEL JAMES SULLIVAN,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 270) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative CLYDE DOYLE, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 1:30 o'clock post meridian, on the 25th day of June 1951, in the case of the *United States v. Joseph P. Kamp*, Criminal Docket No. 1788-50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative CLYDE DOYLE is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States v. Joseph P. Kamp* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on June 25, 1951, at 1:30 p. m., in the case of the United States against Joseph P. Kamp, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of

the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read, as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES v. JOSEPH P. KAMP, No. 1788-50

The President of the United States to Hon. HENDERSON LANHAM, United States Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, June 25, 1951, at 1:30 o'clock p. m., to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 22d day of June A. D. 1951.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, Clerk,

By MICHAEL JAMES SULLIVAN,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 271) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas Representative HENDERSON LANHAM, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 1:30 o'clock p. m., on the 25th day of June 1951, in the case of the *United States v. Joseph P. Kamp*, Criminal Docket No. 1788-50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative HENDERSON LANHAM is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States v. Joseph P. Kamp* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on June 25, 1951, at 2 p. m., in the case of the United States against Joseph P. Kamp, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES v. JOSEPH P. KAMP, No. 1788-50

The President of the United States to Hon. CARL ALBERT, United States Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, June 25, 1951, at 1

o'clock p. m., to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 22d day of June, A. D. 1951.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MICHAEL JAMES SULLIVAN,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 272).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative CARL ALBERT, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 2 o'clock post meridian, on the 25th day of June, 1951, in the case of the *United States v. Joseph P. Kamp*, criminal docket, No. 1788-50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative CARL ALBERT is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States v. Joseph P. Kamp* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on June 25, 1951, at 1:30 p. m., in the case of the United States against Joseph P. Kamp, which is a congressional contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES v. JOSEPH P. KAMP, No. 1788-50

The President of the United States to Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA, United States Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, June 25, 1951; at 1:30 o'clock p. m. to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 22d day of June, A. D. 1951.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MICHAEL JAMES SULLIVAN,
Deputy Clerk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 273).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 1:30 o'clock p. m., on the 25th day of June 1951,

in the case of the *United States v. Joseph P. Kamp*, Criminal Docket No. 1788-50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative JOSEPH P. O'HARA is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States v. Joseph P. Kamp* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of the privilege of the House.

I have been subpoenaed to appear before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify on June 25, 1951, at 1:30 p. m., in the case of the *United States against Joseph P. Kamp*, which is a congressional-contempt proceeding. Under the precedents of the House, I am unable to comply with this subpoena without the consent of the House, the privileges of the House being involved. I, therefore, submit the matter for the consideration of this body.

Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the subpoena.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the subpoena.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—THE UNITED STATES *v.* JOSEPH P. KAMP, No. 1788-50

The President of the United States to Hon. CHARLES A. HALLECK, United States Congress, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

You are hereby commanded to attend the said court on Monday, June 25, 1951, at 1:30 o'clock p. m. to testify on behalf of the United States; and not depart the court without leave of the court or district attorney.

Witness, the Honorable Bolitha J. Laws, chief judge of said court, this 22d day of June A. D. 1951.

[SEAL] HARRY M. HULL, Clerk.

By MICHAEL JAMES SULLIVAN, Deputy Clerk.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 274).

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK, a Member of this House, has been served with a subpoena to appear as a witness before the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, to testify at 1:30 o'clock post meridian, on the 25th day of June 1951, in the case of the *United States v. Joseph P. Kamp*, Criminal Docket No. 1788-50; and

Whereas by the privileges of the House no Member is authorized to appear and testify, but by order of the House: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Representative CHARLES A. HALLECK is authorized to appear in response to the subpoena of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia in the case of the *United States v. Joseph P. Kamp* at such time as when the House is not sitting in session; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be submitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena of said court.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the tax bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. POLK asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to address the House for 40 minutes on Monday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that there may be stricken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement made by me on June 20, 1951, appearing on pages A3905 and A3906.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

ALTERCATIONS AND ASSAULTS

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as today marks the reported fourth occasion on which the same Member of the House has in the Capitol Building and adjoining the House Chamber engaged in an altercation during which he is alleged to have used insulting and provocative words to another Member or in an assault on another Member, in which another Member on this occasion has been grievously injured, it would seem that the appropriate committee of the House might well take under consideration the advisability of legislation which would protect Members of this House and perhaps the Senate, in a somewhat similar manner as men in hazardous occupations are protected and paid compensation when they are injured in the course of their employment. This is a matter the leadership of the House on both sides should give some consideration.

Mr. BENDER. Is being a Member of Congress a hazardous occupation?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Apparently it is becoming very hazardous. We have had the smear-and-gag experts both within and without the administration working on some of us for many years when we did not follow or swallow their party line; and if a man is as peaceful and soft-spoken as is the assaulted Member on this occasion, some of us who venture to disagree in a positive way may be in danger of being liquidated the Stalin way.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include a petition by amputee patients of the Korean War hospitalized at Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, D. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

VETERANS' PETITION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the amputee patients at Walter Reed Hospital have sent a petition to the Congress asking for the passage of the bill H. R. 2983. However, since that petition was started, the Elliott bill, together with the provisions of my bill, H. R. 2983, which takes in the arm amputees and blind, has passed the House.

May I ask, therefore, that that explanation be made so that the petition will now ask that the Senate pass H. R. 4233 which I believe will pass unanimously.

The petition to which I refer follows:

To Eighty-second Congress, First Session—
To the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned amputee patients of the Korean War hospitalized at Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, D. C., urge the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for immediate action on H. R. 2983, a bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Pfc Oscar J. Sidihan, Corp. Franklyn B. Jackson, Jr., Pfc Edward S. Paszkiewicz, Corp. Chas. Kippleheiser, Corp. Theodore Freeman, Corp. Henry Harris, Jr., Pfc Charles Foley, Pfc Norman McClain, Corp. Donald H. Poleat, Corp. Frank P. Foley, Pfc Jerry W. Powell, Sfc Chappel Hampton, Pfc Paul E. Meeks, Pfc Eckford M. Strowd, Pfc Frank D. Brennan, Pfc Gerald A. Polard, Corp. Bill B. Wright, Pfc William A. Abess, Sgt. James Wassmann, Corp. Arthur Willoughby, Pfc L. D. Lane, Jr., Sgt. Calvin G. Beshap, Pfc Lynn E. Mestlor, Pfc Francis J. Elsner, Pfc Leonard J. Sas, Corp. Julio Azenedo Rodriguez, Pfc Allen E. Christian, Sfc B. F. Basset, Corp. Harry W. Carter, Corp. Arnold E. McKerney, Errel J. Sartori, Melvin Rosenberg, Walter G. Lyons.

To Eighty-second Congress, First Session—
To the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

We the undersigned amputee patients of the Korean War hospitalized at Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, D. C., urge the Committee on Veterans Affairs for immediate action on H. R. 2983, a bill to authorize payments by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs on the purchase of automobiles or other conveyances by certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

Carl W. Bonlin, Melvin P. Hood, Herbert J. Adams, Harold L. Lewis, William G. McGregor, Frederick G. Manamon III, Richard A. Lshudy, Alfonso Spencer, Wayne B. Kichitell, Nevel L. Cox, Charles R. Farmer, Gordon R. Merrill, Roy M. Johnson, Charles L. Woody, James C. Wellman, Charles D. Ray, Robert S. Salmon, Lawrence E. Milbee, William O. Steckel, Jr., Edward G. Chapman.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

JULY 11, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. FOGARTY, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3709]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 20, 23, 25, 26, 28, 43, 48, 49, 50, 52, 55, 58, 60, 64, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 92, 94, 97, 107, 108, 109, 110, 121, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 31, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 62, 63, 65, 66, 69, 72, 77, 86, 88, 90, 91, 93, 96, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, and 128, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,350,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,600,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,600,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$2,188,680; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,016,919; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,300,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$4,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,072,825; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$6,859,200; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the number stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert *five*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,300,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$4,361,900; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,475,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$19,123,261; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$18,948,261; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: : *Provided further, That not more than \$900,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$182,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,900,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$10,518,987; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,598,654; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$626,671; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$49,549,400; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$31,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$90,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

SEC. 703. Amounts available from appropriations and other funds in this Act, and amounts specified therein for personal services, are hereby

reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums (except trust funds) to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards, \$31,835;

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses, \$238,461;

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses, \$16,715;

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Salaries and expenses, \$152,293;

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:

Appropriation, \$17,487;

Transfer from Old-age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund, \$3,673;

Salaries, Office of the General Counsel:

Appropriation, \$21,350;

Transfer from Old-age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund, \$21,197;

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses, \$348,541;

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses, \$15,753;

Arbitration and emergency boards, \$6,000;

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses, \$24,251;

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund), \$211,096;

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses, \$135,087;

Boards of inquiry, \$1,250.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the number stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert 706; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 32, 131, and 132.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER MCGRATH,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
FRED E. BUSBEY,

Managers on the part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
LISTER HILL,
H. M. KILGORE,
WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
EDWARD J. THYE,
ZALES N. ECTON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 1—*Salaries and expenses*: Authorizes purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of the replacement of two vehicles as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$1,350,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary, instead of \$1,425,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—*Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor*: Appropriates \$1,600,000, instead of \$1,650,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,575,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards*: Inserts the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$604,870.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights*: Appropriate \$265,758, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$277,000 as proposed by the House, and insert the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$213,603.

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$2,600,000, instead of \$2,692,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,578,682 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$2,188,680 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than \$2,153,049 proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, and 11—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$5,016,919, instead of \$5,245,959 as proposed by the Senate and \$4,635,500 as proposed by the House, of which amount \$1,300,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 instead of \$1,513,765 as proposed by the Senate and \$743,500 as proposed by the House, and of which

total appropriation not more than \$4,200,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$4,351,773 proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 12, 13, and 14—*Grants to States*: Appropriate \$164,560,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$165,560,000 as proposed by the House, of which \$5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, is for the contingency reserve fund instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House; deletes the Senate provision limiting the amount available for personal services.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$1,887,816 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,947,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$1,618,499 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$5,371,352 proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,243,000 proposed by the House, of which not more than \$4,530,755 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate. The conferees of both Houses agree that of the total appropriation available to the Bureau in 1952, \$90,000 should be allotted for studies of foreign labor conditions, such amount to be taken from the amount otherwise available for housing and public construction statistics.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20—*Revision of consumers' price index*: Appropriate \$1,072,825, instead of \$1,125,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$379,285 proposed by the Senate instead of \$389,000 proposed by the House, of which not more than \$317,581 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24: Appropriate \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$8,365,304 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$6,859,200 shall be available for personal services instead of \$7,119,227 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$390,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$374,537 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28—*Salaries and expenses*: Authorize the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles instead of seven as proposed by the House and one as proposed by the Senate, of which two vehicles shall be for replacement only as proposed by the House instead of replacement of only one as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30: Appropriate \$5,300,000, instead of \$5,345,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,172,975 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$4,361,900 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than \$4,218,475 as proposed by the Senate.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Amendment No. 31—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$2,631,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,906,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in disagreement.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Amendment No. 33—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$2,475,000, instead of \$2,525,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,415,084 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Amendments Nos. 34, 35, and 36—*Promotion and further development of vocational education*: Appropriate \$19,123,261, instead of \$20,017,760 as proposed by the Senate and \$18,223,261 as proposed by the House, of which \$18,948,261 is for the Vocational Education Act of 1946 instead of \$19,847,760 as proposed by the Senate and \$18,048,261 as proposed by the House, and amend the provision in the House bill so as to provide that not more than \$900,000 of the appropriation shall be available for vocational education in the distributive occupations.

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$3,397,706 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,253,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$2,893,577 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40—*Payments to school districts*: Appropriate \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$28,000,000 as proposed by the House, and insert the language of the Senate making the appropriation available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874).

Amendment No. 41—*Grants for school construction*: Strikes out the paragraph of the House bill with respect to this appropriation and inserts the Senate paragraph in lieu thereof. The appropriation amount is identical to the House bill. The language agreed upon permits direct provision of school facilities, as authorized by sections 203 and 204 of the basic legislation, in addition to grants to local educational agencies. The conference agreement drops the two provisions of the House bill relating to reimbursement payments under

section 205 of the basic law and to the determination of relative urgency of need for school facilities for purposes of prescribing under section 206 the order in which the Commissioner of Education shall make certifications for payments from the appropriation.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Amendments Nos. 42 and 43—*Payments to States*: Appropriate \$21,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$20,475,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount available for personal services. The conferees of both Houses agree that the reduction below the budget estimate, as agreed upon, should not be applied against the allotment for counseling, guidance, and placement services.

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$675,620 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$705,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$558,220 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Amendment No. 46—*Venereal diseases*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 7 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 47 and 48: Appropriate \$11,653,360 for venereal diseases as proposed by the Senate instead of \$11,700,000 as proposed by the House, and deletes the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 49 and 50—*Tuberculosis*: Appropriate \$8,745,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$8,887,351 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 51—*Assistance to States, general*: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 5 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 10 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52: Deletes the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services from the appropriation "Assistance to States, General."

Amendment No. 53—*Communicable diseases*: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 20 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55: Appropriate \$5,915,747 for communicable diseases as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,090,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 56—*Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 4 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of the provision of the House bill authorizing purchase of not to exceed 11 vehicles of which 9 were for replacement only.

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58: Appropriate \$3,648,158 for "Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,710,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 59 and 60—*Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska*: Appropriate \$1,211,129 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,234,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 61—*Grants for hospital construction*: Appropriates \$182,500,000, instead of \$195,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$175,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 62—*Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed three as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Appropriate \$1,166,465 for salaries and expenses, hospital construction services, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,195,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 65—*Hospitals and medical care*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 9 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 66—*Foreign quarantine service*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 5 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of the language of the House bill authorizing purchase of not to exceed 12 vehicles of which 10 were for replacement only.

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68: Appropriate \$2,900,000 for the Foreign Quarantine Service, instead of \$2,990,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,868,029 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 69—*National Institutes of Health*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed six as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 70 and 71: Appropriate \$15,500,000 for the National Institutes of Health as proposed by the House instead of \$15,559,973 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 72—*National Cancer Institute*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed four as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 73 and 74: Appropriate \$19,500,000 for the National Cancer Institute as proposed by the House instead of \$19,805,171 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 75 and 76—*Mental health activities*: Appropriate \$10,518,987, instead of \$10,737,974 as proposed by the Senate and \$10,300,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 77—*National Heart Institute*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed two as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 78 and 79: Appropriate \$10,000,000 for the National Heart Institute as proposed by the House instead of \$10,072,982 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 80 and 81—*Dental health activities*: Appropriate \$1,598,654, instead of \$1,697,308 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 82, 83, 84, and 85—*Construction of research facilities*: Appropriate \$10,400,000 for continuation of construction of a combined hospital and research building as proposed by the House instead of \$9,445,000 as proposed by the Senate; strike out the Senate language transferring \$955,000 to this item from prior funds for construction of additional auxiliary structures; appropriate \$350,000 for payment of obligations incurred under prior authority for construction of additional auxiliary structures as proposed by the House instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the Senate; and strike out the Senate language authorizing the Surgeon General to enter into arrangements for the construction by private industry of rental quarters for employees of the National Institutes of Health.

Amendments Nos. 86 and 87: Appropriate \$6,635,540 for purchase and installation of additional equipment, supplies, and furnishings for the research center as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,640,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 88 and 89—*Commissioned officers, pay and so forth*: Appropriate \$1,861,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,790,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 90—*Salaries and expenses*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed two as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 91 and 92: Appropriate \$2,745,868 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,850,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Amendment No. 93—*Salaries and expenses*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed three as proposed by the House.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 94 and 95—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions*: Appropriate \$175,000 direct appropriation as proposed by the House instead of \$167,650 as proposed by the Senate, and limit the total, including funds to be derived from collection of

fees, to be available for personal services to not more than \$626,671 instead of not more than \$614,650 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance*: Authorizes purchase of two passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of four as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 97 and 98: Authorize the expenditure of not more than \$58,000,000 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for salaries and expenses of the Bureau, as proposed by the House, instead of not more than \$57,437,980 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$49,549,400 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than \$48,697,378 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 99—*Grants to States for public assistance*: Appropriates \$1,150,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,250,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 100 and 101—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance*: Appropriate \$1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,463,400 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$1,455,400 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 102 and 103—*Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau*: Appropriate \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,450,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$1,238,900 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 104 and 105—*Grants to States for maternal and child welfare*: Appropriate \$31,500,000 instead of \$33,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the language of the House bill providing for pro rata allotment of the appropriation in proportion to the amounts to which the respective States are entitled by reason of section 331 of the 1950 Amendments to the Social Security Act.

Amendments Nos. 106 and 107—*Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner*: Appropriate \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$219,700 as proposed by the House, and in addition authorize transfer from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of not to exceed \$110,300 as proposed by the House instead of not to exceed \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 108—*Public assistance program*: Strikes out the provision of the Senate prohibiting denial of allocation of Federal funds to any State which has by legislative enactment provided the conditions under which public access may be had to the records of the disbursements of grant-in-aid funds and has otherwise complied with the governing statutory provisions.

The conferees of both Houses are agreed that the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress should consider the subject matter of this amendment.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Amendments Nos. 109 and 110—*Salaries, Office of the Administrator*: Appropriate \$2,050,000 from general funds as proposed by the House instead of \$2,150,000 as proposed by the Senate, together with

transfer from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of not to exceed \$403,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$413,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 111—*Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations*: Inserts the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$402,045.

Amendment No. 112—*Salaries, Office of the General Counsel*: Appropriates \$396,478 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$412,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 113—*Surplus property disposal*: Appropriates \$90,000, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$75,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendments Nos. 114 and 115—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$8,233,959 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$6,622,284 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendments Nos. 116 and 117—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$394,247 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$299,307 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 118 and 119—*Arbitration and emergency boards*: Appropriate \$144,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$114,000 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120—*Salaries and expenses, National Railroad Adjustment Board*: Inserts the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$460,774.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Amendment No. 121—*Payment to railroad retirement account*: Strikes out the definite annual appropriation inserted by the Senate and restores the annual indefinite appropriation language of the House bill.

In recommending the annual indefinite form of appropriation, the conferees of both Houses will expect the Bureau of the Budget to withhold from the retirement fund any net overappropriations or overpayments made to the fund from the General Treasury through June 30, 1951.

Amendments Nos. 122 and 123—*Salaries and expenses (from trust funds)*: Authorize \$5,056,904 to be derived from the railroad retirement account for salaries and expenses of the Board as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,268,000 as proposed by House, of which not more than \$4,010,820 shall be available for personal service as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 124 and 125—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$3,047,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,949,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$2,566,653 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 126 and 127—*Boards of inquiry*: Appropriate \$48,750 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$23,750 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 128—*Section 703*: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the provision of the House bill prohibiting the use of funds contained in the act to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year 1952 with certain stated exceptions.

Amendment No. 129—*Further reductions in appropriations and authorizations*: Makes reductions in various appropriations and authorizations carried in the act as set out in detail in the conference report by appropriation title and amount. The Senate amendment provided that each appropriation or authorization made by the act for any purpose, of which a specified portion was made available for personal services, and each amount so specified for personal services, was reduced by an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in the budget estimates. The conferees have agreed on reductions as provided in the Senate amendment in a number of instances. In most of such instances the amounts of the reductions are listed under this amendment in the conference report. In a few other instances, the amounts which would have been available after application of the reductions provided by the Senate amendment have been incorporated in the amendments of the Senate to the individual appropriation paragraphs involved.

Amendment No. 130: Strikes out the language of the Senate providing that no part of any appropriation contained in the act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle other than a bus or ambulance.

Amendment No. 131—*Reduction in number of passenger cars*: Reported in disagreement. The conferees of both Houses have agreed that agencies embraced within this act which operate passenger cars at the seat of Government during fiscal year 1952 shall periodically submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate and to the General Accounting Office a daily trip record of use of the cars so operated.

Amendment No. 132—*Employees engaged in personnel work*: Reported in disagreement. The motion which the House managers will offer on this amendment will provide for exemption of the Public Health Service, during 1952, from the personnel ratio limitation agreed upon, in view of special circumstances existing in that Service. It will be expected, however, that the Service and the Agency will on

their own take steps to improve the existing ratio before the 1953 budget is considered. At that time, the committees expect to fully examine into the matter as regards the Service with view to determining the proper relationship between total personnel and employees engaged in personnel work.

Amendment No. 133: Corrects a section number.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
E. H. HEDRICK,
CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
FRED E. BUSBEY,

Managers on the Part of the House.

○

the Railroad Retirement Act, and will continue on same subject tomorrow morning.

PRICE DISCRIMINATION, BASING POINT

Committee on the Judiciary: Celler Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power opened hearings on H. R. 2820, to clarify the right of sellers to engage in competition by meeting in good faith the equally low price of a competitor. Representative Walter, author of the bill, testified today, followed by Stephen J. Spingarn, Federal Trade Commissioner. Recessed until tomorrow morning.

CLAIMS

Committee on the Judiciary: Byrne Subcommittee No. 2 approved for reporting to the full committee three private claims bills of the House.

Also held a hearing on H. R. 640, for the relief of the estate of John Aubrey Edgington, at which Representative Doyle, author of the measure, and Mrs. Combs, sister of the deceased, furnished testimony. This measure was subsequently ordered reported adversely to the full committee.

FEDERAL PAY INCREASE

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Continued further public hearings in connection with Federal pay increase legislation, and received testimony recommending salary and pay increases from the following representatives of postal and departmental groups: Kenneth Taylor, secretary, National Rural Letter Carriers Association; Jerome Keating, secretary, National Association of Letter Carriers, accompanied by the first vice president, D. R. Sullivan, and the assistant secretary, R. B. Kremers; Paul Castiglioni, legislative representative, National Federation of Post Office Motor Vehicle Employees; Thomas G. Walters, operations director of the Government Employees Council; Col. Heber Rice, member, legislative committee of the Federal Bar Association; and Robert McLaughlin, national counsel, National Association of Storekeeper Gaugers, Alcohol Tax Unit. Statements for the record were also filed by Milton Kelenson, acting legislative representative,

United Public Workers of America; and Thomas Maddock, executive committee member, National Association of Federal Mechanics.

This concludes the schedule of public witnesses to be heard on this legislation, and Members of Congress are expected to testify on the subject when the committee meets tomorrow morning.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Committee on Public Works: Held executive consideration of St. Lawrence seaway-Great Lakes development legislation and agreed to table all but two of the measures which have been introduced on this subject—H. J. Res. 4, by Mr. Blatnik, and H. J. Res. 15, by Mr. Dondero. These joint resolutions will be considered tomorrow morning in an executive session of the committee. The bills that were tabled are H. J. Res. 2, by Mr. Kilburn; H. J. Res. 3, by Mr. Dingell; H. J. Res. 122, by Mr. O'Brien of Michigan; and H. R. 2536, by Mr. Roosevelt.

COMMUNISM

Committee on Un-American Activities: Mrs. Mary Stalcup Markward, housewife of Chesterbrook, Va., testified at today's hearings, which are investigating Communist activities in vital defense areas. Mrs. Markward, operating as a member of the Communist Party, was an undercover agent for the FBI between 1943 and 1949 in the Baltimore-Washington area. She had previously turned over to that Department a list of members of the Washington Communist units. During questioning by committee counsel she revealed the names and activities of Communist Party district leaders and members located in the Washington-Baltimore area. Adjourned until tomorrow morning to hear other witnesses.

Joint Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—LABOR-FSA

Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the House- and Senate-passed versions of H. R. 3709, Labor-FSA appropriations. The report will be filed tonight.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 12

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, subcommittee, executive, on S. 1253, disaster loans, 11 a. m., 324 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, executive, 10 a. m., room F-37, Capitol; Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions, executive, 10:30 a. m., room F-39, Capitol; Subcommittee on Legislative, executive, 10 a. m., room P-38, Capitol; Subcommittee on Armed Services, executive, 10 a. m., 224 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Armed Services, executive, on nominations and calendar, 10:30 a. m., 212 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, RFC Subcommittee, executive, to discuss its final report and Kaiser-Frazer report, 10:30 a. m., 301 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Finance, on H. R. 4473, tax-revision bill, 10 a. m., 312 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on air-mail subsidy bills, 10 a. m., room G-16, Capitol; subcommittee, on S. 1221, Ship Warrants Act, 10 a. m., room P-36, Capitol.

Committee on the Judiciary, subcommittee, on S. 25, to amend Bankruptcy Act, 10:30 a. m., 424 Senate Office Building.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, executive, on Government employees' pay bills, 10 a. m., 135 Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Agriculture, on H. R. 4521, extending the Sugar Act of 1948 until December 31, 1956, 10 a. m., 1310 New House Office Building.

Committee on Armed Services, to consider title III, Air Force, of H. R. 4524, to authorize certain construction at military and naval installations, executive, 10 a. m., 313-A Old House Office Building.

Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, Holifield special subcommittee, to consider Home Loan Bank Board administration and related matters, 10 a. m., 429 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, to continue consideration of the Mutual Security Program. Thomas D. Cabot, Director of International Security Affairs, Department of State, will testify, 10 a. m., room G-3, Capitol.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Indian Affairs, on H. R. 1214, to promote the rehabilitation of the Papago Tribe of Indians, and H. R. 1635, to promote the rehabilitation of the Indians of western Oklahoma, 10 a. m., 1324 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, executive consideration of H. R. 3669, amending the Railroad Retirement Act, 10 a. m., 1334 New House Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, Celler Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power, on H. R. 2820, basing-point legislation, 10 a. m., 346 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, to hear Members of Congress on Federal pay increase bills, 10 a. m., 213 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Public Works, executive meeting on H. J. Res. 4 and 15, St. Lawrence seaway-Great Lakes development legislation, 10 a. m., 1302 New House Office Building.

Committee on Un-American Activities, to continue on Communist activities in the Baltimore, Md., defense area, 10:30 a. m., 226 Old House Office Building.

Select Committee To Investigate the Educational and Training Program Under the GI Bill, to consider administrative aspects of the Veterans' Administration educational program, 10 a. m., 445 Old House Office Building.

Joint Committee

Conferees, executive, on H. R. 3880, independent offices appropriations, 10:30 a. m., room F-82, Capitol.

could be assured that any given project would definitely contribute to the agricultural economy of Italy and to be certain that counterpart funds were being used only for projects which would compare favorably with reclamation projects selected for development in the United States. With this in mind a general criterion was established that only projects would be considered which would guarantee a maximum production of food in a minimum amount of time with a

minimum amount of money. The Mission established a firm policy that no projects would be considered unless they were transmitted to the Mission by the Ministry of Agriculture. This made it possible to relieve the Mission immediately of the burden of discussing projects with pressure groups and individuals who had private interest or an ax to grind, and made it possible for the Mission to devote its time exclusively to the examination of projects which had the

approval and support of the Italian Government.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 13, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, JULY 12, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, whose thoughts concerning us are those of love and peace, we rejoice that Thou art always seeking to inspire us with a more vivid sense of Thy presence and power.

Grant that we may not be primarily concerned about having Thee do something for us but may it be our supreme desire to have Thee do something in us and with us in order that we may fulfill life's high vocation.

We pray that Thou wilt create within our minds and hearts a clearer conception of Thy divine will and a loftier appreciation of our duty toward Thee and our fellow men. May we have a new accent of faith in Thee and the daring to make trial of Thy law of love.

We humbly confess that at times we are deeply troubled and disturbed for we do not seem to know how to deal with the social and industrial and all our human problems in their modern strange and tragic setting.

May we see that we cannot solve these problems without Thee and without those spiritual realities which Thou wouldst have us appropriate and which are the source and secret of conquest.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to add thereto a chapter relating to procedure in condemnation proceedings.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52-1.

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION TAX BILL

(Mr. CAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for one-half minute.)

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, as I did in March of last year, at the request of the section of taxation of the American Bar Association,

a bill (H. R. 4775) providing for the correction of many inequities in our internal-revenue laws.

This bill is the product of long and arduous work on the part of the section of taxation, all of its recommendations having been approved by the American Bar Association.

I feel that the views of the distinguished lawyers who have collaborated in the drafting of this bill are worthy of our most serious thought and study. I have read this bill, and, while I do not necessarily endorse every detail of it, I heartily commend it and the public spirit in which it is offered. In my opinion, if the bill be enacted, it will not materially affect the revenues, but will remove many inequities which should have been corrected long ago.

Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the Record a summary explanation, section by section, of the bill.

My distinguished colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, Mr. REED of New York, is introducing and endorsing an identical bill. He and I feel that the consideration of this bill should be nonpartisan because of its obvious merit and its authorship.

THE LATE CHARLES ASHCRAFT

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of announcing the untimely passing of Charles L. Ashcraft, president of the National Association of Rural Letter Carriers. Mr. Ashcraft died suddenly at his home in Osage City, Kans., late yesterday. Mr. Ashcraft was on a trip attending the State convention of the Kansas unit of his organization.

Mr. Ashcraft represented, as the national president, one of the oldest and most highly regarded organizations of our Federal employees. Nearly every rural carrier belongs to his organization, numbering more than 30,000 members.

Mr. Ashcraft himself had been a rural letter carrier for a period of 33 years on a rural route emanating from Osage City, which is located in our district in Kansas. Prior to holding the position of president of the National Letter Carriers' Association, Mr. Ashcraft served 2 years as vice president of the association. He was elected president of this organization in 1950. It is a fitting tribute to the high respect with which he was held by members of his organization that when elected to these positions, in each case it was without opposition.

I had the pleasure of being acquainted with Mr. Ashcraft in his own community before he was elevated to the high position conferred upon him by his organization. The people where he lived and whom he served held Charlie Ashcraft in great respect and the highest esteem.

The Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House has always appreciated the fine cooperation of Mr. Ashcraft in working toward the solution of problems with which the committee has been faced and which related to the interests of the rural carriers. Our committee has often sought his advice. We will miss him from among our counselors. I know the members of our committee join with me in expressing deep regret in the passing of Mr. Ashcraft. We extend our sympathy to the members of his bereaved family and to his immediate friends.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 108]

Allen, Ill.	Gillette	O'Konski
Allen, La.	Gregory	Powell
Breen	Hoeven	Prouty
Chatham	Jackson, Calif.	Taylor
Chipfield	Kelley, Pa.	Werdel
Davis, Tenn.	Martin, Iowa	Whitaker
Dawson	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Dingell	Miller, Calif.	Winstead
Dolliver	Murray, Wis.	Woodruff
Durham	Nelson	
Gamble	Norblad	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 395 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 11, 1951.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, we have before us this morning the conference report on the annual appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related agencies. The budget estimates for this bill amounted to \$2,744,253,760. The House bill appropriated \$2,641,206,361, which was a decrease of \$103,047,399. The Senate bill provided \$2,523,678,214. The conference report which we are presenting to you this morning totals \$2,512,004,270. The Senate had cut the House bill by \$118,000,000. The Senate bill was \$221,000,000 under the Budget estimates. The conference bill before you today is under the budget estimates by \$232,000,000 and \$129,000,000 under the bill as passed by the House. Also it is under the Senate bill as passed by that body by \$11,000,000 plus.

I think the conferees have done a good job on this particular bill, because as I stated in my previous statement on the floor when we had this bill before us, this is one of the most difficult bills to cut. As I pointed out at that time, 88 percent of the appropriations for the Department of Labor rests in two items, for the grants to States for unemployment compensation and the employees injury compensation fund. Those two items alone amount to 88 percent of the total appropriation for the Department of Labor and over which we have no control. With reference to the Federal Security Agency, 86 percent of the total for that agency is accounted for by public assistance grants, emergency school aid, and the hospital construction program.

So, Mr. Speaker, with these large amounts that we cannot do anything about because of the laws we have passed, making it mandatory upon the Federal Government to meet certain costs as they arise in the various States, we think we have done a good job in reducing the total amounts.

One of the first things we were confronted with when we sat down in conference with the Members of the other body was the three amendments requiring blanket cut-backs in personal services. As you know, the House passed the so-called Jensen amendment, which was tied on to the end of the bill. The Senate subcommittee eliminated the Jensen amendment and went before the full committee and came up with the Cordon amendment, which was a 5-percent reduction in personal service estimates as presented by the Bureau of the Budget. Then, on the Senate floor the Ferguson amendment was adopted, which added an additional 5-percent cut to the Cordon amendment. After meeting with the Senate conferees for a couple of days and discussing the Jensen amendment, the Cordon amendment, and the Ferguson amendment, we finally agreed that the more reasonable way to cut expenditures was to adopt the modified Ferguson amendment. That is what we have done in this bill. We did not forget either that the House passed the Jensen amendment. I think the figures we have before us today will show that in practically every item there is a reduction below the House bill. For example, in the Department of Labor, in the Office of Secretary,

this conference report shows a reduction of \$75,000 below the House figure. In the Office of Solicitor we show a reduction of \$50,000 below the House figure.

In the Bureau of Labor Standards we show a reduction of \$31,835 below the House figure.

In the veterans' employment rights we show a decrease of \$11,242.

In the Bureau of Apprenticeship Training we show a decrease of \$92,000.

In the Bureau of Employment Security we show a decrease of \$381,000.

In grants for employment security we show a decrease of \$1,000,000.

In the Bureau of Employees' Compensation we show a decrease of \$59,000.

In the Bureau of Labor Statistics we show a decrease of \$110,000.

In the Women's Bureau we show a decrease of \$26,000.

The Wage and Hour Division remains the same.

There is one item in the Department of Labor that shows an increase, and that is in the Consumers Price Index, which is an agency that has enough money to wind up its activities in the next fiscal year. The House cut that figure by \$250,000, and the Senate put back \$125,000, because they said they needed that full amount to finish their activities in the next fiscal year. We will not have it in this bill again. We finally got the Senate to recede to the extent of giving them not \$250,000 but \$73,000, and that is the only increase in the House figures in the Department of Labor.

So we did keep in consideration the effect of the Jensen amendment by showing all of these figures below the bill as it passed the House. The figures total \$1,764,000 below the House bill of a couple of months ago, on the Labor Department.

In the Federal Security Agency the bill shows a decrease in practically every item right down the line, which shows that we still accepted in part some of the Jensen amendment, and also kept intact the modified Ferguson amendment.

There were some increases in the Federal Security Agency. One of the increases was for payments to school districts for operation and maintenance, \$12,000,000. In the House we allowed \$28,000,000, which was the full budget estimate. They had an additional estimate which came before the Senate and that full estimate of \$12,000,000 was granted by the Senate. The conferees went along with that, because with that money they are not able now to meet the applications that they have at this time. They now have before us a request for a supplemental appropriation of \$6,000,000 for that particular program for fiscal 1951. So the conferees thought at this time we should go along with the Senate figure on that.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. That is to implement Public Law 874, maintenance and operation, in your impacted school districts?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. Would the gentleman be kind enough to advise the House what action you took on the provision for additional construction money?

Mr. FOGARTY. There was no disagreement with the Senate figures in the money available for the construction of schools but we did change the language.

Mr. BAILEY. They get \$75,000,000.

Mr. FOGARTY. They get \$75,000,000.

Mr. BAILEY. What change was made in the limitation?

Mr. FOGARTY. The conferees struck out the paragraphs of the House bill with respect to this item and inserted the paragraphs of the Senate bill.

The appropriation amount is identical to the House bill. The language agreed upon permits direct provision of school facilities, as authorized by sections 203 and 204 of the basic legislation, in addition to grants to local educational agencies. The conference agreement drops the two provisions of the House bill relating to reimbursement payments under section 205 of the basic law and to the determination of relative urgency of need for school facilities for purposes of prescribing under section 206 the order in which the Commissioner of Education shall make certifications for payments from the appropriation.

Mr. BAILEY. Am I to understand from the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island that that leaves pretty much in the discretion of the Commissioner where this money shall be expended first?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes; it does.

Mr. BAILEY. Where the need is greatest?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. BAILEY. There is no restriction on his discretion.

Mr. FOGARTY. No, except such restrictions as the basic law contains.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman answer one more question? What provision was made for distributive education?

Mr. FOGARTY. As the bill passed the House we had no money in it for distributive education. Their request was far \$1,794,000. We compromised with the Senate and allowed \$900,000 for distributive education and specifically stated in the report that no more than \$900,000 may be used for distributive education so that the main vocational education program would not be disturbed.

Mr. BAILEY. The entire vocational educational program was \$19,000,000, something like that, I believe. I want to compliment the committee on increasing that item. I have always felt in our committee that the \$28,000,000 we suggested was insufficient and I am pleased to note that that has been taken care of. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, there was another amendment that the Senate had raised and that was the hospital construction program. As it passed the House, the House allowed \$75,000,000 for additional projects; the Senate added another \$20,000,000 to that particular program. We compromised on the figure of \$7,500,000 additional, or \$82,500,000, in lieu of the \$20,000,000 additional amount that the Senate had allowed.

I think that covers the more important amendments, particularly the increases; and I am very happy to say that we have been able to get the Senate to recede in this conference to the tune of nearly \$2,000,000 below their own bill.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. Naturally, no conference report could go as far as I would like to go in cutting expenditures; but, all in all, I think we did a fairly good job everything considered. There is one item in this conference report which I did not see until just a few minutes ago when the conference report was made available. It pertains to the so-called Jenner amendment that was written into the Senate bill. The Jenner amendment, as most of you know, deals with the appropriation for grants to States. It was the understanding that there was some disposition on the part of Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, to withhold funds from the State of Indiana. The new law of Indiana goes into effect about August 1 of this year which, in effect, says that the names of all those receiving aid under the law governing public welfare must be given to the county auditor and also to the township trustees, and members of the county council.

The language in the report near the bottom of page 13 reads as follows:

The conferees of both houses are agreed that the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress should consider the subject matter of this amendment.

That statement to me is like a candidate running on a platform of being against sin and for pure drinking water. There is no dispute that I know of, but that it should be considered by the proper legislative committees and permanent legislation put on the books. Even if the Jenner amendment were accepted it would only be for 1 year because that is the length of time this appropriation bill covers. It was my understanding in the conference that language would be put into this report making it very plain to Mr. Oscar Ewing it is the opinion of the conferees that the State of Indiana and also the State of Tennessee, which are the only two States affected at present, should not be penalized because of some technicality in the Federal law. I fail to see that in the conference report. I would like to have the gentleman comment on that.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am very happy to comment on that because I referred to it in conference yesterday afternoon and disagreed with that suggestion as it came up. The Senate receded on that and knocked this amendment out of the bill. It receded, and, as a consequence, we do not have it before us today. We agreed on that one sentence that this is legislation on an appropriation bill when it was added by the Senate and was subject to a point of order. The Senate agreed. We had no hearing on it, we do not know all the facts about it on this side of the House and we thought it was a proper responsibility of the legislative committee. As we have done

other cases in conference reports and in reports on appropriation bills, we send matters like this to the proper legislative committee. That was the agreement of the conferees as we left on yesterday afternoon to refer this to the proper legislative committee.

Mr. BUSBEY. I appreciate the legislative angle, but I would like to hear the gentleman's remarks on the language that I thought was going to be inserted in the conference report to let Mr. Ewing know exactly what the conferees thought. The language in the report is merely stating a legislative principle.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought I explained that, because I spoke against that suggestion on yesterday afternoon and after I had spoken against it the Senate agreed it should not be in there. We come in with this suggestion that it be as it is written in here, which is the agreement of the conferees reached on yesterday afternoon. There was not any dispute about it at all.

Mr. BUSBEY. I am sorry. I was at the conference and I got an entirely different impression as to what language was going to be put in the conference report.

Mr. FOGARTY. The Senate agreed to that language as it appears in the report.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. In connection with the hospital construction program the House agreed to seventy-five million and there were seven and a half million added. Is that the Hill-Burton hospital program in eight States?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes. There were seventy-five million for new construction. They will have \$82,500,000 for new construction in the fiscal year 1952.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as every Member will note who has read the newspapers this morning and also this report that the conferees have stricken from the bill the Jensen amendment. I listened very attentively to the gentleman from Rhode Island explain the provisions of the conference report and noted that he stated in regard to many items that they were lower even than the House bill, which, of course, I approve as does every Member who wants and works for economy and against waste.

I notice, however, that the amounts which were cut from the administrative personnel requests have been reduced very little in comparison with what the Jensen amendment would save.

The conference agreed to some specific cuts as you will see on page 5 of the report. All of those cuts amount to a total of just a little over \$1,000,000. The Jensen amendment would effect savings of at least \$10,000,000. We went into this thing very carefully before the Jensen amendment was offered in the House. We went through these two departments to which this bill applies and the different branches of those departments and

determined as nearly as we could what the savings would be under the Jensen amendment. Now, of course, it is impossible to say exactly what the savings would be, but we estimated that as closely and as carefully as we could, and the savings would be, as I said, something over \$10,000,000 and there is no question about it, I assure you.

Now then, let us not forget that the Jensen amendment takes no one off the payroll, it simply keeps people from getting on the Federal payroll. It provides that only 25 percent of the vacancies which occur, with certain exceptions, may be filled. There are a lot of men and women working for the Government, career folks, good folks, able, conscientious public servants who have reached the age of 45, 50, or 55 years, who have families and they have children going to school and to college, now under these specific cuts that are made in this conference report, some of those folks will lose their jobs; that is a certainty. Now, I do not propose to have that on my conscience when there is a better and less painful way to do the job and save more money. My amendment provides that no one shall lose their jobs, just as most every county, most every State, and most every big municipality in America did in the depression days when they simply did not have the heart to throw people off the payroll, and so they simply did not fill vacancies, and it worked well. No one suffered. Now, if there are those in this House that want to take folks off the payroll the painful way, and you know who will be taken off; it will be the career men and women who will lose their jobs; it will not be the employees who have power up here on the Hill and elsewhere to keep their jobs.

So, Mr. Speaker, I shall offer a motion to send this report back to conference with instructions to insist on retaining the Jensen amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, in this particular instance the subcommittee and the conferees on the part of the House met and worked diligently with the Members of the Senate conferees. There were a number of items which I felt should have been lower than they were. I wanted to see the Jensen amendment included and the Senate recede from its action, but there was no opportunity in the conference to effect that sort of understanding and agreement. As a matter of fact, the items, money-wise, were very satisfactory, I think, except in a few instances. In those instances we could not prevail.

In reference to the Jensen amendment, it occurred to me, and did at the time the House passed it, that it would affect those whom we sought to reach, namely, those we call the bureaucrats, those higher-ups, and would not cut off some of those down lower who do the real work at the service level. I think the committee members on the whole and the conferees representing the House would have liked to have seen that accomplished. Under the circumstances, it occurred to me that we could

not do more than we did. I thought and suggested in the conference just before it adjourned that we might tie together the so-called Ferguson amendment, which is a dollarwise cut in appropriations, and the Jensen amendment, which is a personnel cut. I thought we could effect a compromise by throwing the two together and working them in together, but the conferees did not see my way on that.

I think, on the whole, the conferees did about all they could do in this case.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have reported this bill back here with a conference report striking out the Jensen amendment. The Jensen amendment is the amendment which the Congress needs to put in the bill, if we intend to effect real economies.

I understand, and I should like to be corrected if this is not so, that just as soon as the previous question is ordered the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN] will offer a motion to recommit with instructions to further insist upon the disagreement to Senate amendment No. 128, which is the striking out of the Jensen amendment.

Mr. JENSEN. I already have the motion at the desk.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman already has sent it to the desk and is prepared to offer it?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did not the House get considerable credit throughout the country by making certain cuts?

Mr. TABER. It did.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If we now go ahead with this conference report, those who want this money will get it just the same?

Mr. TABER. There will be some that will. There are some cuts that are made that were not made by the House. There are some the House made that have been eliminated. We ought to have credit for establishing a rule which will eliminate unnecessary employees. I hope that when we get to vote upon the motion we will adopt it and send the bill back to conference.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. I am going to speak for a few moments and then move the previous question. At that time the gentleman from Iowa will have a chance to offer his motion.

Mr. Speaker, in every conference I have been in when members of the Appropriations Committee or when members of legislative committees met with the Senate we have found that a conference committee is a compromising committee. We debated the effects of the Jensen amendment, the Cordon amendment, and the Ferguson amendment with the Senate conferees on four different days. As the gentleman from Iowa knows, his amendment was stricken by the Senate from the bill a year ago and the Senate action was agreed to in

conference on the one-package bill at that time. The Senate subcommittee considering this 1952 bill eliminated the gentleman's amendment immediately and adopted the Cordon amendment.

The reasons why they did it are too numerous to mention, because of the way the gentleman's amendment would work, but they are obvious. The Cordon amendment effected a 5-percent reduction, not in over-all expenditures, but in personnel expenses.

The Ferguson floor amendment adds an additional 5 percent—not on over-all expenditures as you have stated on the floor. It put on practically every agency in this bill a limitation on personal services. If that is not a reduction in personal services, I would like to know what would be a reduction in personal services. The gentleman from Iowa surprises me when he says he does not want to fire anybody in the service. I will admit that under the Ferguson amendment, and under the related limitations on personal services, that Federal employees are going to be fired and they are going to be fired under this bill. Many of them are going to be fired.

But I do not agree with you that your amendment would affect the so-called bureaucrats, as you call them, and some of those that you want to get rid of because your amendment will not touch them. Your amendment refers to vacancies. Vacancies occur on the turnover of employees in the Federal Government. Where does that turn-over come? The turn-over comes largely in the lower brackets of Federal employees right down the line. That is where your amendment hits. The Ferguson amendment, as the conferees saw it, represents a compromise. We realize that we had to come back to the House with something. We knew we could not disregard the effects of the Jensen amendment and the Cordon amendment and the Ferguson amendment in view of the votes in both Houses. We all agreed on that. We all agreed we had to show some reductions. We went along with the Ferguson amendment on the limitation on personal services. What does that mean? That means salaries and expenses. That is getting at the persons on the Federal payroll. That was a direct cut against existing personnel on the Federal payroll now. That limitation is carried in practically every item with the exception of one, and that is items of the Public Health Service. We eliminated limitations on the Public Health Service because the amendment would not work at present in that particular Service. We know that we had to come back here and we think we have done a good job. We spent more time in the conference on this bill this year than we have ever spent in conference. We spent 4 days working with the Members of the other body, while in other years we frequently finished the conference in 1 day, and we had to take so long because of the different provisions that we had to consider.

You say we only save a million dollars. You are making claims about what your amendment would save in this particular bill, but your claims are

not based on any facts at all and you do not have any facts upon which to base your claims. We have the figures compiled by our staff of the Committee on Appropriations and the figures from the Bureau of the Budget, as to what your amendment would accomplish and it comes nowhere near the amount that you claim would be saved. And talking to anybody in business or anybody in a Federal agency who wants to show reductions in Federal personnel, your amendment was most unworkable. Under this amendment when they are getting a direct cut they know where they are going to get cut and they are going to get cut now so that they know what they are going to have to operate on during the next fiscal year. They have to cut that personnel and that is the more sensible way of approaching this problem of reduction in Federal personnel.

I agree with you, Mr. JENSEN, that this is a direct cut. It means that Federal employees are going to be fired. I have been hearing that story so often for the past 7 or 8 years that I thought that is what you wanted to accomplish, and that is what the conferees have brought back today, a modified Ferguson amendment with the limitation on personal services and salaries and expenditures which will mean that Federal employees are going to be fired. I am sure that the lower strata will not be hurt as much as the upper strata will, because that is where many of them will be fired.

Mr. Ewing's own office was hit hard in this bill. His appropriation is cut \$379,000 which was the biggest cut he ever took. From the tables I have seen, he has got to eliminate the higher paid positions, the publications and reports sections, and administrative services of that particular agency. They are the higher paid personnel. I understand some of them have already been given notice, because of the contemplated action of the conferees in adopting the so-called modified Ferguson amendment.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Is not the situation something like this: both the Ferguson amendment and the Jensen formula have merit? The Jensen formula is the more nearly painless of the two. Is it not a fact that the Ferguson amendment has two weaknesses. First, that the agencies of Government may postpone the cuts until the end of the year, because they do not like to lose actual working employees, and then come up and, under pressure of necessity, ask for supplementary appropriations; and, second, if the agencies make the cuts now, as you would like to force them to do, will they not make those cuts in the most sensitive places they can possibly make them, so that there will be pressure exercised constantly on the Congress to reduce or prevent the cuts?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, I do not believe that is so. I have talked with the budget officers of both departments, and they have already given out notices of re-

duction in personnel right down the line. They have no idea, as far as I know, of coming back here for any supplemental appropriations at all. They are giving out these notices now for a reduction of force. The Ferguson amendment is not only a 10 percent reduction in some cases, but it amounts to a 12 or 13 percent reduction in personnel, because all of the notices they have to give now they have to reduce so many more in order to have the necessary money to pay their terminal annual leave. In some cases it amounts to a 13 or 14 percent reduction. That is directed to personnel. In the Jensen amendment no mention is made about operating expenses of the particular agency at all. The Ferguson amendment cuts down only salaries and the Jensen amendment made no provision at all to cut down expenses other than salaries that go with an agency. So what is the use of cutting down personnel and still allow them the same amount for printing and binding, travel, and all these other items? In the conference committee we have dealt with that, and we are recapturing this amount, percentage-wise, that would not have been recaptured under your amendment or the Ferguson amendment.

I think we have gone that much further than your amendment or the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. JENSEN: Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman will agree, will he not, that the personnel in the Labor and Federal Security department amounted in 1950 to 43,900 employees; in 1951 they had 46,800; and in this bill they requested for 1952 48,600 employees. Of course, if you only make these small, token cuts you will still have possibly a thousand more people than you have now.

Mr. FOGARTY. No; that statement is not correct. In the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance—

Mr. JENSEN. Now, just a moment. This is according to the facts and figures in the Bureau of the Budget request.

Mr. FOGARTY. The statement you just made is not correct. You said these token cuts that we made are only going to get rid of a few personnel. That is not a true statement. In the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, they are being cut, under the Ferguson amendment, about 500. I do not believe they could stand that cut. We finally allowed them the House figure, which is still \$2,000,000 below the budget request, and much of their appropriation is for salaries, so there is going to have to be a cut in personnel.

Mr. JENSEN. But the gentleman will admit that the General Accounting Office has reduced its personnel over 50 percent during the past 5 years and yet they have taken on even more duties, but the morale of the organization is higher than it has ever been and they are doing a good job.

Mr. FOGARTY. I admit they are doing a good job.

Mr. JENSEN. And Lindsay Warren accomplished that job by abolishing

branches and by not filling vacancies. Now, if Lindsay Warren can do it—although I must say that he is one of the most able administrators we have in Washington—certainly there are other administrators or heads of departments who can do the same thing. Any man who can take three from four can certainly do it under the Jensen amendment, but, of course, there may be some in the department who cannot take three from four and find that it leaves one.

Mr. FOGARTY. I admit that the General Accounting Office is an effective organization, but I do not agree with the claims the gentleman makes for it. Notwithstanding the fact that personnel in the General Accounting Office was cut 50 percent that does not mean that other personnel was not added in other agencies to take care of work the General Accounting Office threw back on them. So in the long run it is not a net reduction of personnel in the Government but only in that one office; other personnel had to be employed in other agencies to take up the load dropped by the General Accounting Office.

I tried to make a case on that yesterday before the conferees. When we reorganized the Social Security office in 1947 under you Republicans—you did it—I took the floor and said I did not agree with you, that I did not think it was a good thing. But I do admit that it worked out and that a good job was done. In Social Security they cut from 300-some jobs down to 60, but they had to distribute that work to other bureaus. Although there was a big reduction and a big savings, they did not reduce it by the number of personnel claimed. The same thing applies to Lindsay Warren's General Accounting Office; it effected some savings, but not as much as is claimed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. JENSEN. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JENSEN moves to recommit the report to the committee of conference with instructions to further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 128.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 223, nays 170, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 109]

YEAS—223

Aandahl	Allen, Calif.	Andresen,
Abbott	Andersen,	August H.
Abernethy	H. Carl	Andrews
Adair	Anderson, Calif.	Angell

Arends	Fulton	Patten
Armstrong	Gathings	Patterson
Auchincloss	Gavin	Phillips
Ayres	George	Pickett
Baker	Golden	Potter
Bakewell	Goodwin	Poulson
Bates, Mass.	Graham	Prouty
Beall	Gross	Radwan
Beamer	Gwinn	Rankin
Belcher	Hagen	Reece, Tenn.
Bender	Hale	Reed, Ill.
Bennett, Mich.	Hall	Reed, N. Y.
Berry	Edwin Arthur	Rees, Kans.
Betts	Hall,	Regan
Bishop	Leonard W.	Ribicoff
Blackney	Halleck	Riehlman
Boggs, Del.	Hand	Rivers
Bolton	Harden	Robeson
Bow	Harrison, Va.	Rogers, Mass.
Bramblett	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Tex.
Bray	Harvey	Sadlak
Brehm	Hébert	St. George
Brown, Ohio	Herlong	Saylor
Brownson	Herter	Schwabe
Bryson	Heslton	Scott, Hardie
Budge	Hess	Scott,
Buffett	Hill	Hugh D., Jr.
Burdick	Hinshaw	Scrivner
Burleson	Hoffman, Ill.	Scudder
Burton	Hoffman, Mich.	Seely-Brown
Busbey	Holmes	Shafer
Bush	Hope	Sheehan
Butler	Horan	Short
Byrnes, Wis.	Hull	Simpson, Ill.
Canfield	Hunter	Simpson, Pa.
Carlyle	James	Sittler
Case	Jarman	Smith, Kans.
Chenoweth	Jenison	Smith, Va.
Chiperfield	Jenkins	Smith, Wis.
Church	Jensen	Springer
Clevenger	Jonas	Stanley
Cole, Kans.	Jones,	Stefan
Cole, N. Y.	Woodrow W.	Stockman
Corbett	Judd	Taber
Cotton	Kean	Talle
Coudert	Kearney	Taylor
Cox	Kearns	Tollefson
Crawford	Keating	Towe
Crumpacker	Kersten, Wis.	Vail
Cunningham	Kilburn	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mo.	Latham	Van Zandt
Curtis, Nebr.	LeCompte	Vaughn
Dague	Lucas	Velde
Davis, Ga.	McConnell	Vorys
Davis, Wis.	McCulloch	Vursell
Dempsey	McDonough	Watts
Denny	McGregor	Weichel
Devereux	McMillan	Wharton
D'Ewart	McVey	Wheeler
Dondero	Mack, Wash.	Widnall
Donovan	Martin, Mass.	Wigglesworth
Dorn	Meador	Williams, Miss.
Doughton	Merrow	Williams, N. Y.
Eaton	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Ind.
Ellsworth	Miller, Nebr.	Wilson, Tex.
Elston	Morano	Winstead
Fallon	Morton	Withrow
Fellows	Mumma	Wolcott
Fenton	Murray, Tenn.	Wolverton
Fisher	Nicholson	Wood, Ga.
Ford	Norblad	Wood, Idaho
Forrester	O'Hara	
Fugate	Ostertag	

NAYS—170

Addonizio	Cooley	Hardy
Albert	Cooper	Harris
Anfuso	Crosser	Hart
Aspinall	Dawson	Havener
Bailey	Deane	Hays, Ark.
Barden	DeGraffenried	Hays, Ohio
Baring	Delaney	Hedrick
Barrett	Denton	Heffernan
Bates, Ky.	Dollinger	Heller
Battle	Donohue	Holifield
Beckworth	Doyle	Howell
Bennett, Fla.	Eberharter	Irving
Bentsen	Elliott	Jackson, Wash.
Blatnik	Evins	Javits
Boggs, La.	Feighan	Jones, Ala.
Bolling	Fine	Jones, Mo.
Bonner	Flood	Jones,
Bosone	Fogarty	Hamilton C.
Brooks	Forand	Karsten, Mo.
Brown, Ga.	Frazier	Kelly, N. Y.
Buckley	Furcolo	Kennedy
Burnside	Garmatz	Kilday
Byrne, N. Y.	Gary	King
Camp	Gordon	Kirwan
Cannon	Gore	Klein
Carnahan	Granahan	Kluczynski
Celler	Granger	Lane
Chelf	Grant	Lanham
Chudoff	Green	Lantaff
Combs	Greenwood	Larcade

Lesinski	O'Brien, Mich.	Sasscer
Lind	O'Neill	Secrest
Lyle	Passman	Shelley
McCarthy	Patman	Sieminski
McCormack	Perkins	Sikes
McGrath	Philbin	Smith, Miss.
McGuire	Poage	Spence
McKinnon	Polk	Staggers
McMullen	Preston	Steed
Machrowicz	Price	Stigler
Mack, Ill.	Priest	Sutton
Magee	Quinn	Tackett
Mahon	Rabaut	Teague
Mansfield	Rains	Thomas
Marshall	Ramsay	Thompson, Tex.
Miller, Calif.	Reams	Thornberry
Mills	Redden	Trimble
Mitchell	Rhodes	Vinson
Morgan	Richards	Walter
Morris	Riley	Welch
Morrison	Roberts	Whitten
Moulder	Rodino	Wickersham
Multer	Rogers, Colo.	Wier
Murdock	Rogers, Fla.	Willis
Murphy	Rooney	Yates
Norrell	Roosevelt	Yorty
O'Brien, Ill.	Sabath	Zablocki

NOT VOTING—39

Allen, Ill.	Gillette	Miller, N. Y.
Allen, La.	Gossett	Murray, Wis.
Boykin	Gregory	Nelson
Breen	Hillings	O'Konski
Chatham	Hoeven	O'Toole
Clemente	Jackson, Calif.	Powell
Colmer	Johnson	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kelley, Pa.	Thompson,
Dingell	Keogh	Mich.
Dolliver	Kerr	Werdel
Durham	Lovre	Whitaker
Engle	Madden	Woodruff
Fernandez	Martin, Iowa	
Gamble	Mason	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Allen of Illinois for, with Mr. Gregory against.

Mr. Gillette for, with Mr. Dingell against.

Mr. Woodruff for, with Mr. Durham against.

Mr. Boykin for, with Mr. Whitaker against.

Mr. Hoeven for, with Mr. Madden against.

Mr. Mason for, with Mr. Keogh against.

Mr. Hillings for, with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania against.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. O'Toole against.

Mr. Gossett for, with Mr. Sheppard against.

Mr. Dolliver for, with Mr. Chatham against.

Mr. Martin of Iowa for, with Mr. Clemente against.

Mr. Colmer for, with Mr. Powell against.

Mr. Fernandez for, with Mr. Engle against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Miss Thompson of Michigan.

Mr. Breen with Mr. Miller of New York.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Lovre.

Mr. DEANE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SITTler changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it not in order to move to adopt the conference report with instructions?

The SPEAKER. It has been recommit-
ted to the committee of conference.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood it was re-
committed with instructions to accept
this amendment.

The SPEAKER. It has to go back to
conference before the House has any fur-
ther opportunity to act.

(Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given
permission to revise and extend the re-
marks he made on the conference re-
port.)

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask
unanimous consent that all Members
may have three legislative days in which
to extend their remarks on the bill just
under consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to
the request of the gentleman from Rhode
Island?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS TO DEFENSE PRODUCTION
ACT OF 1950

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move
that the House resolve itself into the
Committee of the Whole House on the
State of the Union for the further con-
sideration of the bill (H. R. 3871) to
amend the Defense Production Act of
1950, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself
into the Committee of the Whole House
on the State of the Union for the further
consideration of the bill H. R. 3871, with
Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires
to state that when the Committee rose
on yesterday the Committee was consid-
ering section 103, ending on line 2, page
14 of the bill. If there are no further
amendments at this point, the Clerk will
read.

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman,
I offer an amendment, which I send to
the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REED of Illi-
nois: Page 11, line 16, after the word "cor-
poration", insert the following proviso:
"Provided, however, That prior to the dis-
posal to private interests of any plant or
plants or other property which cost the Gov-
ernment \$1,000,000, or more, or of any pat-
ents, processes, techniques, or inventions ir-
respective of cost, the corporation shall ob-
tain from the Attorney General an opinion
as to whether such disposal will result in a
violation of the antitrust laws."

(Mr. REED of Illinois asked and was
given permission to extend his remarks
at this point.)

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Chairman,
the amendment which I offer is not sub-
stantive but rather qualifying, correc-
tive, and preventive.

The legislation before us is a compre-
hensive amendment or series of amend-
ments to the Defense Production Act of
1950 and, of course, contains much new
matter that the committee deemed ad-
visable and the elimination of portions
of existing law that may have become
obsolete or in the opinion of the com-
mittee undesirable or unnecessary.

As may be expected in a task as in-
tricate as that which faced the commit-
tee there are omissions that were prob-
ably unnoticed but that can be restored
at this time. Let me call your attention
to one.

In section 103 (d), on page 11, begin-
ning with line 5, a new subsection is set
up. It provides that any corporation
created under this section shall have
the power to sue and be sued, and so
forth, and, on line 5 "acquire, hold, and
dispose of property."

During the last war the act enabling
the Defense Plant Corporation to ac-
quire and to hold property did not in-
clude the power to dispose of it. That
power was not given to the agency until
the enactment of the Surplus Property
Act of 1944.

In that act, the Congress provided
that the Attorney General should be
consulted before large defense plants or
patent rights were disposed of to private
persons. The present bill contains no
such provision for consultation with the
Attorney General.

It seems highly desirable for the dis-
posal agencies to obtain the opinion of
the Attorney General before disposing
of any large plants for two reasons.
First of all, the Government should not
dispose of its war plants without con-
sidering the impact of such property
disposal on small business and its pos-
sible tendency to encourage the growth
of monopoly power. In the second place,
since the market for defense plants may
in large part be made up of large cor-
porations, it is important for such po-
tential buyers to have the benefit of the
opinion of the Attorney General before
purchasing surplus war property and,
as a result, possibly finding themselves
subject to the charge that they have
become monopolies in violation of the
Sherman Act.

Without the amendment which I am
offering, and without further detailed
legislation, there is a danger that the
disposal of war plants might create se-
rious antitrust problems. Undue dislo-
cations of the domestic economy must
be avoided. An opportunity for full and
equitable distribution of such facilities
must be assured.

I might add that the definition of
property to which this amendment ap-
plies, namely, to plants which cost the
Government over \$1,000,000 and to pat-
ented processes irrespective of cost—is
taken verbatim from section 20 of the
Surplus Property Act of 1944.

For 2½ years the Committee on the
Judiciary has had a special subcommit-
tee on the study of monopoly power.
At the present time this subcommittee
is composed of 11 members—6 on the
majority side and 5 on the minority side.
The attention of our subcommittee was
called to the addition of the words "dis-
pose of" in line 9 of page 11 of the pend-
ing bill and of the omission of the re-
quirement that the Attorney General
should render an opinion as to whether
such disposal will result in a violation
of the antitrust laws.

Recognizing, of course, that jurisdic-
tion of the legislation now before us is
vested in the Committee on Banking and
Currency we, nevertheless, informally
considered the situation created by an
inadvertent omission of what we con-
sider an important proviso.

The pending amendment will restore it. It is offered by me, individually and on my own responsibility and it has the approval of all ten of my colleagues of the Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I see no objection to the amendment, and, as far as I am personally concerned, I am willing to accept it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might affirm what the chairman of the committee has just said. I think the amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. REED].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUFFETT: Page 8, line 25, strike out all of subsection (e).

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to suggest that the Members look at the subsection beginning at the bottom of page 8, which I propose to strike out, starting with line 25. I want to read it to you so that you can see exactly what the provision in the bill will do:

Whenever in his judgment—

That is, the President's judgment—

it will aid the national defense, the President is authorized (1) to acquire by purchase, donation, condemnation, or other means of transfer any real property, including facilities, or other interests therein, and to erect and construct plants, factories, and other industrial facilities for the purposes of manufacturing, producing, and processing materials necessary to the national defense and to engage in the marketing, transportation, and storage of such materials.

The balance of that section is pretty largely in the law already, and my motion contemplates that existing provisions should continue unchanged.

But I respectfully suggest to you that the language proposed in this subsection would give the President many new powers, including full power to nationalize almost any industry in the country, if he so desired.

The way the bill reads, he could take over the oil industry from the refinery down to the corner filling station, because it gives him the power to engage in that industry, to take it over, to build refining plants, to build and operate filling stations. He could engage in transportation; he could go into practically any kind of business in this country, if he decided it was in the interest of national defense.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Under that authority, the President could build storage facilities

ties to take care of the biggest wheat crop we ever had. Has the gentleman thought of that?

Mr. BUFFETT. The Government is already doing that and has the power to do it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. He could take over all the hospitals of the country and force socialized medicine upon the people of this country; because if he controls the physical properties he controls the medical profession. It would mean socialized medicine.

Mr. BUFFETT. Under this language he could take over the packing houses of the country, plus the meat markets; and he could operate a fleet of trucks to take meat from the packing houses to the markets. In other words he could nationalize whole segments of industry. That is what this section of the bill would permit the President to do when he and he alone decided in the interest of national defense that he wanted to do it.

The Joint Committee on the Economic Report took up this subject some time ago and here is what they said:

While such might be necessary in an all-out war effort it handicaps our long run chances to maintain a maximum of free private enterprise and reduces our reliance upon the creative impetus of private initiative. We recommend against this proposal except in limited fields where it is clearly demonstrated to be necessary.

The President already has various powers to build Government defense plants and to do almost anything he wants for national defense. This would give him extreme power.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. As I understand this is a very definite enlargement of the provisions of existing law; is that correct?

Mr. BUFFETT. I would say that it is an extreme enlargement of existing law.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. What if any showing was made of any necessity for such power as this?

Mr. BUFFETT. To the best of my recollection there was no substantial showing; it was not particularly discussed in committee except by some opposition witnesses who pointed out to the committee the extreme grant of power that this provision represented.

I believe this House ought to think twice before it adopts a clause that on its face would allow the President to take over a great part of the industrial plant of these United States. We hope he is not going to do it, but I think when you give the President large powers you want to spell them out unless you want to accept the consequences of unlimited power as created in the clause that we are now discussing.

This subsection has no restrictions. He can take over any real property, any facilities, he could market commodities, he could take over transportation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. As I recall it, we passed legislation preventing the taking over of hotels and various other businesses in this country unless it was cleared by a certain committee, we will say the Armed Services Committee. Would this not empower the President to take over any hotel, any place he wanted to, under the guise that it is necessary to the national defense, and if he can would he not be running contrary to a question settled by this House in the negative on a vote recently taken?

Mr. BUFFETT. Whether he could take over hotels under this specific provision, I cannot advise the gentleman, but I would say to him it would certainly permit the President to take over any manufacturing enterprise that might be identified with the national defense effort, and; he could take over marketing industries, if he decided they were identified with the national defense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. In all the three volumes of testimony, can the gentleman point to a single bit of evidence or testimony against this provision, having in mind that it was in the original bill as introduced?

Mr. BUFFETT. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. Was there any evidence or testimony adduced before the committee against this provision?

Mr. BUFFETT. If the gentleman will read page 1428 of the testimony, he will find at the bottom of that page where our attention was specifically called to a comment by the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, where that committee recommended against this proposal as a result of their deliberations. I should mention in passing that the other body in passing this bill did not see fit to include anything approximating this grant of power.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. JONAS. If the President can exercise all of these power that the gentleman has enumerated under this provision, it would lay the foundation, would it not, for dictatorship in this

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

AUGUST 16, 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. FOGARTY, from the committee of conference, submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3709]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 20, 23, 25, 26, 28, 43, 48, 49, 50, 52, 55, 58, 60, 64, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 92, 94, 97, 107, 108, 109, 110, 121, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 31, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 62, 63, 65, 66, 69, 72, 77, 86, 88, 90, 91, 93, 96, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, and 133, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,350,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,600,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,600,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$2,188,680; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,016,919; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,300,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$4,200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,072,825; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$6,859,200; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the number stricken out and proposed by said amendment insert *five*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,300,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$4,361,900; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,475,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$19,123,261; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$18,948,261; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House reeede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: : *Provided further, That not more than \$900,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$182,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$2,900,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$10,518,987; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,598,654; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$626,671; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$49,549,400; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$31,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$90,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent ap-

pointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: Provided, That this inhibition shall not apply—

- (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;
- (b) to positions filled from within and by transfer to the department or agency;
- (c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;
- (d) to Saint Elizabeths Hospital and Freedmen's Hospital;
- (e) to the Public Health Service;
- (f) to educational institutions; and
- (g) to personnel engaged in law enforcement:

Provided further, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 129:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

SEC. 704. Amounts available from appropriations and other funds in this Act, and amounts specified therein for personal services, are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums (except trust funds) to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards, \$31,835;

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses, \$238,461;

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses, \$16,715;

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Salaries and expenses, \$152,293;

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:

Appropriation, \$17,487;

Transfer from Old-age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund, \$3,673;

*Salaries, Office of the General Counsel:**Appropriation, \$21,350;**Transfer from Old-age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund, \$21,197;**NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD**Salaries and expenses, \$348,541;**NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD**Salaries and expenses, \$15,753;**Arbitration and emergency boards, \$6,000;**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD**Salaries and expenses, \$24,251;**RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD**Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund), \$211,096;**FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE**Salaries and expenses, \$135,087;**Boards of inquiry, \$1,250.**And the Senate agree to the same.**The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 32, 131, and 132.*

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
 JOHN J. ROONEY,
 CHRISTOPHER McGRATH,
 WINFIELD K. DENTON,
 CLARENCE CANNON,
 GEO. B. SCHWABE.

Managers on the part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
 RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
 LISTER HILL,
 H. M. KILGORE,
 WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
 EDWARD J. THYE,
 ZALES N. ECTON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Amendment No. 1—*Salaries and expenses*: Authorizes purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of the replacement of two vehicles as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$1,350,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary, instead of \$1,425,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—*Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor*: Appropriates \$1,600,000, instead of \$1,650,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,575,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards*: Inserts the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$604,870.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights*: Appropriate \$265,758, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$277,000 as proposed by the House, and insert the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$213,603.

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$2,600,000, instead of \$2,692,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,578,682 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$2,188,680 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than \$2,153,049 proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, and 11—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$5,016,919, instead of \$5,245,959 as proposed by the Senate and \$4,635,500 as proposed by the House, of which amount \$1,300,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 instead of \$1,513,765 as proposed by the Senate and \$743,500 as proposed by the House, and of which

total appropriation not more than \$4,200,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$4,351,773 proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 12, 13, and 14—*Grants to States*: Appropriate \$164,560,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$165,560,000 as proposed by the House, of which \$5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, is for the contingency reserve fund instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House; deletes the Senate provision limiting the amount available for personal services.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$1,887,816 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,947,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$1,618,499 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$5,371,352 proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,243,000 proposed by the House, of which not more than \$4,530,755 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate. The conferees of both Houses agree that of the total appropriation available to the Bureau in 1952, \$90,000 should be allotted for studies of foreign labor conditions, such amount to be taken from the amount otherwise available for housing and public construction statistics.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20—*Revision of consumers' price index*: Appropriate \$1,072,825, instead of \$1,125,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$379,285 proposed by the Senate instead of \$389,000 proposed by the House, of which not more than \$317,581 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24: Appropriate \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$8,365,304 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$6,859,200 shall be available for personal services instead of \$7,119,227 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$390,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$374,537 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28—*Salaries and expenses*: Authorize the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles instead of seven as proposed by the House and one as proposed by the Senate, of which two vehicles shall be for replacement only as proposed by the House instead of replacement of only one as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30: Appropriate \$5,300,000, instead of \$5,345,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,172,975 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$4,361,900 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than \$4,218,475 as proposed by the Senate.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Amendment No. 31—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$2,631,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,906,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in disagreement.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Amendment No. 33—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriates \$2,475,000, instead of \$2,525,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,415,084 as proposed by the Senate.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Amendments Nos. 34, 35, and 36—*Promotion and further development of vocational education*: Appropriate \$19,123,261, instead of \$20,017,760 as proposed by the Senate and \$18,223,261 as proposed by the House, of which \$18,948,261 is for the Vocational Education Act of 1946 instead of \$19,847,760 as proposed by the Senate and \$18,048,261 as proposed by the House, and amend the provision in the House bill so as to provide that not more than \$900,000 of the appropriation shall be available for vocational education in the distributive occupations.

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$3,397,706 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,253,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$2,893,577 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40—*Payments to school districts*: Appropriate \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$28,000,000 as proposed by the House, and insert the language of the Senate making the appropriation available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874).

Amendment No. 41—*Grants for school construction*: Strikes out the paragraph of the House bill with respect to this appropriation and inserts the Senate paragraph in lieu thereof. The appropriation amount is identical to the House bill. The language agreed upon permits direct provision of school facilities, as authorized by sections 203 and 204 of the basic legislation, in addition to grants to local educational agencies. The conference agreement drops the two provisions of the House bill relating to reimbursement payments under

section 205 of the basic law and to the determination of relative urgency of need for school facilities for purposes of prescribing under section 206 the order in which the Commissioner of Education shall make certifications for payments from the appropriation.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Amendments Nos. 42 and 43—*Payments to States*: Appropriate \$21,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$20,475,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount available for personal services. The conferees of both Houses agree that the reduction below the budget estimate, as agreed upon, should not be applied against the allotment for counseling, guidance, and placement services.

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$675,620 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$705,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$558,220 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Amendment No. 46—*Venereal diseases*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 7 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 47 and 48: Appropriate \$11,653,360 for venereal diseases as proposed by the Senate instead of \$11,700,000 as proposed by the House, and deletes the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 49 and 50—*Tuberculosis*: Appropriate \$8,745,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$8,887,351 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 51—*Assistance to States, general*: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 5 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 10 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52: Deletes the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services from the appropriation "Assistance to States, General."

Amendment No. 53—*Communicable diseases*: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 20 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55: Appropriate \$5,915,747 for communicable diseases as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,090,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 56—*Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 4 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of the provision of the House bill authorizing purchase of not to exceed 11 vehicles of which 9 were for replacement only.

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58: Appropriate \$3,648,158 for "Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,710,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 59 and 60—*Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska*: Appropriate \$1,211,129 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,234,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 61—*Grants for hospital construction*: Appropriates \$182,500,000, instead of \$195,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$175,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 62—*Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed three as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Appropriate \$1,166,465 for salaries and expenses, hospital construction services, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,195,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 65—*Hospitals and medical care*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 9 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 66—*Foreign quarantine service*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 5 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of the language of the House bill authorizing purchase of not to exceed 12 vehicles of which 10 were for replacement only.

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68: Appropriate \$2,900,000 for the Foreign Quarantine Service, instead of \$2,990,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,868,029 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 69—*National Institutes of Health*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed six as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 70 and 71: Appropriate \$15,500,000 for the National Institutes of Health as proposed by the House instead of \$15,559,973 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 72—*National Cancer Institute*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed four as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 73 and 74: Appropriate \$19,500,000 for the National Cancer Institute as proposed by the House instead of \$19,805,171 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 75 and 76—*Mental health activities*: Appropriate \$10,518,987, instead of \$10,737,974 as proposed by the Senate and \$10,300,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 77—*National Heart Institute*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed two as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 78 and 79: Appropriate \$10,000,000 for the National Heart Institute as proposed by the House instead of \$10,072,982 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 80 and 81—*Dental health activities*: Appropriate \$1,598,654, instead of \$1,697,308 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 82, 83, 84, and 85—*Construction of research facilities*: Appropriate \$10,400,000 for continuation of construction of a combined hospital and research building as proposed by the House instead of \$9,445,000 as proposed by the Senate; strike out the Senate language transferring \$955,000 to this item from prior funds for construction of additional auxiliary structures; appropriate \$350,000 for payment of obligations incurred under prior authority for construction of additional auxiliary structures as proposed by the House instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the Senate; and strike out the Senate language authorizing the Surgeon General to enter into arrangements for the construction by private industry of rental quarters for employees of the National Institutes of Health.

Amendments Nos. 86 and 87: Appropriate \$6,635,540 for purchase and installation of additional equipment, supplies, and furnishings for the research center as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,640,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 88 and 89—*Commissioned officers, pay and so forth*: Appropriate \$1,861,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,790,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 90—*Salaries and expenses*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed two as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 91 and 92: Appropriate \$2,745,868 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,850,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Amendment No. 93—*Salaries and expenses*: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed three as proposed by the House.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 94 and 95—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions*: Appropriate \$175,000 direct appropriation as proposed by the House instead of \$167,650 as proposed by the Senate, and limit the total, including funds to be derived from collection of

fees, to be available for personal services to not more than \$626,671 instead of not more than \$614,650 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance*: Authorizes purchase of two passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of four as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 97 and 98: Authorize the expenditure of not more than \$58,000,000 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for salaries and expenses of the Bureau, as proposed by the House, instead of not more than \$57,437,980 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$49,549,400 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than \$48,697,378 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 99—*Grants to States for public assistance*: Appropriates \$1,150,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,250,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 100 and 101—*Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance*: Appropriate \$1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,463,400 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$1,455,400 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 102 and 103—*Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau*: Appropriate \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,450,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$1,238,900 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 104 and 105—*Grants to States for maternal and child welfare*: Appropriate \$31,500,000 instead of \$33,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the language of the House bill providing for pro rata allotment of the appropriation in proportion to the amounts to which the respective States are entitled by reason of section 331 of the 1950 Amendments to the Social Security Act.

Amendments Nos. 106 and 107—*Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner*: Appropriate \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$219,700 as proposed by the House, and in addition authorize transfer from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of not to exceed \$110,300 as proposed by the House instead of not to exceed \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 108—*Public assistance program*: Strikes out the provision of the Senate prohibiting denial of allocation of Federal funds to any State which has by legislative enactment provided the conditions under which public access may be had to the records of the disbursements of grant-in-aid funds and has otherwise complied with the governing statutory provisions.

The conferees of both Houses are agreed that the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress should consider the subject matter of this amendment.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Amendments Nos. 109 and 110—*Salaries, Office of the Administrator*: Appropriate \$2,050,000 from general funds as proposed by the House instead of \$2,150,000 as proposed by the Senate, together with

transfer from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of not to exceed \$403,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$413,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 111—*Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations*: Inserts the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$402,045.

Amendment No. 112—*Salaries, Office of the General Counsel*: Appropriates \$396,478 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$412,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 113—*Surplus property disposal*: Appropriates \$90,000, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$75,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendments Nos. 114 and 115—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$8,233,959 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$6,622,284 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendments Nos. 116 and 117—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$394,247 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$299,307 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 118 and 119—*Arbitration and emergency boards*: Appropriate \$144,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$114,000 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120—*Salaries and expenses, National Railroad Adjustment Board*: Inserts the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$460,774.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Amendment No. 121—*Payment to railroad retirement account*: Strikes out the definite annual appropriation inserted by the Senate and restores the annual indefinite appropriation language of the House bill.

In recommending the annual indefinite form of appropriation, the conferees of both Houses will expect the Bureau of the Budget to withhold from the retirement fund any net overappropriations or overpayments made to the fund from the General Treasury through June 30, 1951.

Amendments Nos. 122 and 123—*Salaries and expenses (from trust funds)*: Authorize \$5,056,904 to be derived from the railroad retirement account for salaries and expenses of the Board as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,268,000 as proposed by House, of which not more than \$4,010,820 shall be available for personal service as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 124 and 125—*Salaries and expenses*: Appropriate \$3,047,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,949,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$2,566,653 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 126 and 127—*Boards of inquiry*: Appropriate \$48,750 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$23,750 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 128—*Section 703*: Restores the provision of the House bill containing restrictions on the filling of personnel vacancies that may occur during the fiscal year 1952 in positions for which funds are provided by the bill, amended to change the list of exemptions as agreed upon by the conferees, and to provide that when the total number of personnel subject to this provision has been reduced to 90 percent of the total number provided for in the 1952 budget estimates, the restrictions of this provision may cease to apply.

The conferees of both Houses are agreed that the savings which accrue from the operation of the provisions of this section of the bill shall not be diverted to or expended for any other purpose but shall be impounded in the appropriations and other funds and returned to the Treasury, and will expect the agencies concerned to proceed accordingly.

Amendment No. 129—*Further reductions in appropriations and authorizations*: Makes reductions in various appropriations and authorizations carried in the act as set out in detail in the conference report by appropriation title and amount. The Senate amendment provided that each appropriation or authorization made by the act for any purpose, of which a specified portion was made available for personal services, and each amount so specified for personal services, was reduced by an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in the budget estimates. The conferees have agreed on reductions as provided in the Senate amendment in a number of instances. In most of such instances the amounts of the reductions are listed under this amendment in the conference report. In a few other instances, the amounts which would have been available after application of the reductions provided by the Senate amendment have been incorporated in the amendments of the Senate to the individual appropriation paragraphs involved.

Amendment No. 130: Strikes out the language of the Senate providing that no part of any appropriation contained in the act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle other than a bus or ambulance.

Amendment No. 131—*Reduction in number of passenger cars*: Reported in disagreement. The conferees of both Houses have agreed that agencies embraced within this act which operate passenger cars at the seat of Government during fiscal year 1952 shall periodically submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate

and to the General Accounting Office a daily trip record of use of the cars so operated.

Amendment No. 132—*Employees engaged in personnel work*: Reported in disagreement. The motion which the House managers will offer on this amendment will provide for exemption of the Public Health Service, during 1952, from the personnel ratio limitation agreed upon, in view of special circumstances existing in that Service. It will be expected, however, that the Service and the Agency will on their own take steps to improve the existing ratio before the 1953 budget is considered. At that time, the committees expect to fully examine into the matter as regards the Service with view to determining the proper relationship between total personnel and employees engaged in personnel work.

Amendment No. 133: Corrects a section number.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,
Managers on the Part of the House.



and ten million gallons of alcohol. The RFC uses alcohol in the manufacture of synthetic rubber. We indicated to alcohol distillers that we would consider the purchase of alcohol made from this flood-damaged grain at prices not over 70 cents per gallon delivered.

At a 70-cent price for alcohol, the distillers should be able to pay in the neighbor-

hood of \$1 per bushel for the water-soaked grain. This compares with distress sales which were being made to feeders at prices as low as 15 cents per bushel.

In this way the RFC is obtaining alcohol at about 15 cents a gallon under the market; at the same time giving the Kansas and Missouri grain people a fair price for water-soaked grain.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, August 20, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

THURSDAY, AUGUST 16, 1951

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Father, as we go forth daily to meet our tasks and responsibilities in this time of crisis and confusion, may we heed Thy divine exhortation, "Wait on the Lord and be of good courage."

We humbly acknowledge that we are frequently tempted to lose heart and hope. May we have a faith that will give us a sense of serenity and security when the winds are contrary and the going is so very difficult.

Help us to feel that every duty is worthy of our best endeavor and that the noblest contribution which we can make to life is to have some part in establishing Thy kingdom of righteousness and peace upon this earth.

May we yield ourselves to the leading of Thy spirit, confident that where Thou dost guide Thou wilt also provide.

To Thy name, through Christ, our Saviour, we shall ascribe all the praise. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Landers, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4386. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CORDON, Mr. KNOWLAND, and Mr. THYE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 52-4.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, H. R. 3709.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 887)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 20, 23, 25, 26, 28, 43, 48, 49, 50, 52, 55, 58, 60, 64, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 92, 94, 97, 107, 108, 109, 110, 121, and 130.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 4, 5, 6, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 21, 22, 31, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 45, 46, 47, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 59, 62, 63, 65, 66, 69, 72, 77, 86, 88, 90, 91, 93, 96, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, and 133.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$2,188,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amend-

ment insert "\$5,016,919"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$4,200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,072,825"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$6,859,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the number stricken out and proposed by said amendment, insert "five"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$4,361,900"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,475,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$19,123,261"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$18,948,261"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That not more than \$900,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$182,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$2,900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 75: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 75, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$10,518,987"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,598,654"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$626,671"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 98: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 98, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$49,549,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 104: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$31,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 113: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 113, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$90,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 128: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 123, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

"(a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;

"(b) to positions filled from within and by transfer to the department or agency;

"(c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;

"(d) to Saint Elizabeths Hospital and Freedmen's Hospital;

"(e) to the Public Health Service;

"(f) to educational institutions; and

"(g) to personnel engaged in law enforcement: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply.

Amendment numbered 129: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 704. Amounts available from appropriations and other funds in this Act, and amounts specified therein for personal services, are hereby reduced in the sum hereinafter set forth, such sums (except trust funds) to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act, as follows: "

"DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

"Office of the Secretary

"Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards, \$31,835;

"Bureau of Labor Statistics

"Salaries and expenses, \$238,461;

"Women's Bureau

"Salaries and expenses, \$16,715;

"FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

"Office of Education

"Salaries and expenses, \$152,293;

"Office of the Administrator

"Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:

"Appropriation, \$17,487;

"Transfer from Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund, \$3,673;

"Salaries, Office of the General Counsel:

"Appropriation, \$21,350;

"Transfer from Old-age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund, \$21,197;

"NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

"Salaries and expenses, \$348,541;

"NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

"Salaries and expenses, \$15,753;

"Arbitration and emergency boards, \$6,000;

National Railroad Adjustment Board

"Salaries and expenses, \$24,251;

"RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

"Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund), \$211,096;

"FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

"Salaries and expenses, \$135,087;

"Boards of inquiry, \$1,250."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 32, 131, and 132.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,

JOHN J. ROONEY,

CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,

WINFIELD K. DENTON,

CLARENCE CANNON,

GEO. B. SCHWABE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,

LISTER HILL,

H. M. KILGORE,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,

EDWARD J. THYE,

ZALES N. ECTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, submit the following statement

in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of the replacement of two vehicles as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$1,350,000 for salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary, instead of \$1,425,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: Appropriates \$1,600,000, instead of \$1,650,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,575,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: Inserts the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$604,870.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights: Appropriate \$265,758, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$277,000 as proposed by the House, and insert the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$213,603.

Bureau of Apprenticeship

Amendments Nos. 7 and 8—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$2,600,000, instead of \$2,692,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,578,682 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$2,188,680 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than \$2,153,049 proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Employment Security

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, and 11—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$5,016,919, instead of \$5,245,959 as proposed by the Senate and \$4,635,500 as proposed by the House, of which amount \$1,300,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 instead of \$1,513,765 as proposed by the Senate and \$743,500 as proposed by the House, and of which total appropriation not more than \$4,200,000 shall be available for personal services instead of \$4,351,773 proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 12, 13, and 14—Grants to States: Appropriate \$161,560,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$165,560,000 as proposed by the House, of which \$5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, is for the contingency reserve fund instead of \$6,000,000 as proposed by the House; deletes the Senate provision limiting the amount available for personal services.

Bureau of Employees' Compensation

Amendments Nos. 15 and 16—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$1,887,816 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,947,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$1,618,499 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Bureau of Labor Statistics

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$5,371,352 proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,243,000 proposed by the House, of which not more than \$4,530,755 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate. The conferees of both Houses agree that of the total appropriation available to the Bureau in 1952, \$90,000 should be allotted for studies of foreign labor conditions, such amount to be taken from the amount otherwise available for housing and public construction statistics.

Amendments Nos. 19 and 20—Revision of consumers' price index: Appropriate \$1,072,-

825, instead of \$1,125,000 as proposed by the Senate, and \$1,000,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Women's Bureau

Amendments Nos. 21 and 22—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$379,285 proposed by the Senate instead of \$339,000 proposed by the House, of which not more than \$317,581 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Wage and Hour Division

Amendments Nos. 23 and 24: Appropriate \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$8,365,304 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$6,859,200 shall be available for personal services instead of \$7,119,227 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

Columbia Institution for the Deaf

Amendments Nos. 25 and 26—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$390,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$374,537 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Food and Drug Administration

Amendments Nos. 27 and 28—Salaries and expenses: Authorize the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles instead of seven as proposed by the House and one as proposed by the Senate, of which two vehicles shall be for replacement only as proposed by the House instead of replacement of only one as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30: Appropriate \$5,300,000, instead of \$5,345,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,172,975 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$4,361,900 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than \$4,218,475 as proposed by the Senate.

Freedmen's Hospital

Amendment No. 31—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,631,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,906,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 32: Reported in disagreement.

Howard University

Amendment No. 33—Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$2,475,000, instead of \$2,525,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,415,084 as proposed by the Senate.

Office of Education

Amendments Nos. 34, 35, and 36—Promotion and further development of vocational education: Appropriate \$19,123,261, instead of \$20,017,760 as proposed by the Senate and \$18,223,261 as proposed by the House, of which \$18,948,261 is for the Vocational Education Act of 1946 instead of \$19,847,760 as proposed by the Senate and \$18,048,261 as proposed by the House, and amend the provision in the House bill so as to provide that not more than \$900,000 of the appropriation shall be available for vocational education in the distributive occupations.

Amendments Nos. 37 and 38—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$3,397,706 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,253,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$2,893,577 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 39 and 40—Payments to school districts: Appropriate \$40,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$28,000,000 as proposed by the House, and insert the language of the Senate making the appropriation available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of the act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874).

Amendment No. 41—Grants for school construction: Strikes out the paragraph of the House bill with respect to this appropriation and inserts the Senate paragraph in lieu thereof. The appropriation amount is identical to the House bill.

The language agreed upon permits direct provision of school facilities, as authorized by sections 203 and 204 of the basic legislation, in addition to grants to local educational agencies. The conference agreement drops the two provisions of the House bill relating to reimbursement payments under section 205 of the basic law and to the determination of relative urgency of need for school facilities for purposes of prescribing under section 206 the order in which the Commissioner of Education shall make certifications for payments from the appropriation.

Office of Vocational Rehabilitation

Amendments Nos. 42 and 43—Payments to States: Appropriate \$21,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$20,475,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount available for personal services. The conferees of both Houses agree that the reduction below the budget estimate, as agreed upon, should not be applied against the allotment for counseling, guidance, and placement services.

Amendments Nos. 44 and 45—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$675,620 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$705,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$558,220 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Public Health Service

Amendment No. 46—Venereal diseases: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 7 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 47 and 48: Appropriate \$11,653,360 for venereal diseases as proposed by the Senate instead of \$11,700,000 as proposed by the House, and deletes the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 49 and 50—Tuberculosis: Appropriate \$8,745,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$8,287,351 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 51—Assistance to States, general: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 5 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 10 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 52: Deletes the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services from the appropriation "Assistance to States, General."

Amendment No. 53—Communicable diseases: Authorizes the purchase of not to exceed 10 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 20 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 54 and 55: Appropriate \$5,915,747 for communicable diseases as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,090,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 56—Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 4 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of the provision of the House bill authorizing purchase of not to exceed 11 vehicles of which 9 were for replacement only.

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58: Appropriate \$3,648,158 for "Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene" as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,710,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 59 and 60—Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: Appropriate \$1,211,129 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,234,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the

Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 61—Grants for hospital construction: Appropriate \$182,500,000, instead of \$195,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$175,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 62—Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed three as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: Appropriate \$1,166,465 for salaries and expenses, hospital construction services, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$1,195,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 65—Hospitals and medical service: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed 9 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed 15 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 66—Foreign quarantine service: Authorize purchase of not to exceed 5 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate, instead of the language of the House bill authorizing purchase of not to exceed 12 vehicles of which 10 were for replacement only.

Amendments Nos. 67 and 68: Appropriate \$2,900,000 for the Foreign Quarantine Service, instead of \$2,990,000 as proposed by the House and \$2,868,029 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 69—National Institutes of Health: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed six as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 70 and 71: Appropriate \$15,500,000 for the National Institutes of Health as proposed by the House instead of \$15,559,973 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 72—National Cancer Institute: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed four as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 73 and 74: Appropriate \$19,500,000 for the National Cancer Institute as proposed by the House instead of \$19,805,171 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 75 and 76—Mental health activities: Appropriate \$10,518,987, instead of \$10,737,974 as proposed by the Senate and \$10,300,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 77—National Heart Institute: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed two as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 78 and 79: Appropriate \$10,000,000 for the National Heart Institute as proposed by the House instead of \$10,072,982 as proposed by the Senate, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 80 and 81—Dental health activities: Appropriate \$1,598,654, instead of \$1,697,308 as proposed by the Senate and \$1,500,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 82, 83, 84, and 85—Construction of research facilities: Appropriate \$10,400,000 for continuation of construction of a combined hospital and re-

search building as proposed by the House instead of \$9,445,000 as proposed by the Senate; strike out the Senate language transferring \$955,000 to this item from prior funds for construction of additional auxiliary structures; appropriate \$350,000 for payment of obligations incurred under prior authority for construction of additional auxiliary structures as proposed by the House instead of \$250,000 as proposed by the Senate; and strike out the Senate language authorizing the Surgeon General to enter into arrangements for the construction by private industry of rental quarters for employees of the National Institutes of Health.

Amendments Nos. 83 and 87: Appropriate \$6,635,540 for purchase and installation of additional equipment, supplies, and furnishings for the research center as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,640,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendments Nos. 83 and 89—Commissioned officers, pay and so forth: Appropriate \$1,861,500 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,793,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Amendment No. 90—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed two as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 91 and 92: Appropriate \$2,745,868 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,850,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services.

Saint Elizabeths Hospital

Amendment No. 93—Salaries and expenses: Authorizes purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only as proposed by the Senate instead of not to exceed three as proposed by the House.

Social Security Administration

Amendments Nos. 94 and 95—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: Appropriate \$175,000 direct appropriation as proposed by the House instead of \$167,650 as proposed by the Senate, and limit the total, including funds to be derived from collection of fees; to be available for personal services to not more than \$626,671 instead of not more than \$614,650 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 96—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: Authorizes purchase of two passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of four as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 97 and 93: Authorize the expenditure of not more than \$58,000,000 from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for salaries and expenses of the Bureau, as proposed by the House, instead of not more than \$57,457,930 as proposed by the Senate, of which not more than \$49,549,400 shall be available for personal services instead of not more than \$43,697,378 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 93—Grants to States for public assistance: Appropriates \$1,150,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,250,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 100 and 101—Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: Appropriate \$1,600,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,493,400 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$1,455,400 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 102 and 103—Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: Appropriate \$1,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$1,450,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$1,238,900 shall be

available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 104 and 105—Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: Appropriate \$31,500,000 instead of \$33,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House, and delete the language of the House bill providing for pro rata allotment of the appropriation in proportion to the amounts to which the respective States are entitled by reason of section 331 of the 1950 Amendments to the Social Security Act.

Amendments Nos. 106 and 107—Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: Appropriate \$200,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$219,700 as proposed by the House, and in addition authorize transfer from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of not to exceed \$110,300 as proposed by the House instead of not to exceed \$100,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 108—Public assistance program: Strikes out the provision of the Senate prohibiting denial of allocation of Federal funds to any State which has by legislative enactment provided the conditions under which public access may be had to the records of the disbursements of grant-in-aid funds and has otherwise complied with the governing statutory provisions.

The conferees of both Houses are agreed that the appropriate legislative committees of the Congress should consider the subject matter of this amendment.

Office of the Administrator

Amendments Nos. 109 and 110—Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Appropriate \$2,050,000 from general funds as proposed by the House instead of \$2,150,000 as proposed by the Senate, together with transfer from the old-age and survivors insurance trust fund of not to exceed \$493,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$413,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 111—Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations: Inserts the Senate provision limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$492,045.

Amendment No. 112—Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Appropriates \$393,473 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$412,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 113—Surplus property disposal: Appropriates \$90,000, instead of \$100,000 as proposed by the House and \$75,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Amendments Nos. 114 and 115—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$3,232,959 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$3,000,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$3,622,284 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Amendments Nos. 116 and 117—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$394,247 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$400,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$299,307 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 118 and 119—Arbitration and emergency boards: Appropriate \$144,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$150,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$114,000 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120—Salaries and expenses, National Railroad Adjustment Board: Inserts the Senate language limiting the amount to be available for personal services to not more than \$460,774.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Amendment No. 121—Payment to railroad retirement account: Strikes out the definite annual appropriation inserted by the Sen-

ate and restores the annual indefinite appropriation language of the House bill.

In recommending the annual indefinite form of appropriation, the conferees of both Houses will expect the Bureau of the Budget to withhold from the retirement fund any net overappropriations or overpayments made to the fund from the General Treasury through June 30, 1951.

Amendments Nos. 122 and 123—Salaries and expenses (from trust funds): Authorize \$5,056,904 to be derived from the railroad retirement account for salaries and expenses of the Board as proposed by the Senate instead of \$5,268,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$4,010,820 shall be available for personal service as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Amendments Nos. 124 and 125—Salaries and expenses: Appropriate \$3,047,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,940,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$2,563,653 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 126 and 127—Boards of inquiry: Appropriate \$43,750 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$50,000 as proposed by the House, of which not more than \$23,750 shall be available for personal services as proposed by the Senate.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 128—Section 703: Restores the provision of the House bill containing restrictions on the filling of personnel vacancies that may occur during the fiscal year 1952 in positions for which funds are provided by the bill, amended to change the list of exemptions as agreed upon by the conferees, and to provide that when the total number of personnel subject to this provision has been reduced to 90 percent of the total number provided for in the 1952 budget estimates, the restrictions of this provision may cease to apply.

The conferees of both Houses are agreed that the savings which accrue from the operation of the provisions of this section of the bill shall not be diverted to or expended for any other purpose but shall be impounded in the appropriations and other funds and returned to the Treasury, and will expect the agencies concerned to proceed accordingly.

Amendment No. 129—Further reductions in appropriations and authorizations: Makes reductions in various appropriations and authorizations carried in the act as set out in detail in the conference report by appropriation title and amount. The Senate amendment provided that each appropriation or authorization made by the act for any purpose, of which a specified portion was made available for personal services, and each amount so specified for personal services, was reduced by an amount equal to 5 percent of the amount requested for personal services for such purpose in the budget estimates. The conferees have agreed on reductions as provided in the Senate amendment in a number of instances. In most of such instances the amounts of the reductions are listed under this amendment in the conference report. In a few other instances, the amounts which would have been available after application of the reductions provided by the Senate amendment have been incorporated in the amendments of the Senate to the individual appropriation paragraphs involved.

Amendment No. 130: Strikes out the language of the Senate providing that no part of any appropriation contained in the act shall be used to pay the compensation of any civilian employee of the Government whose duties consist of acting as chauffeur or driver of any Government-owned passenger motor vehicle other than a bus or ambulance.

Amendment No. 131—Reduction in number of passenger cars: Reported in disagreement. The conferees of both Houses have agreed that agencies embraced within this act which operate passenger cars at the seat of Government during fiscal year 1952 shall periodically submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate and to the General Accounting Office a daily trip record of use of the cars so operated.

Amendment No. 132—Employees engaged in personnel work: Reported in disagreement. The motion which the House managers will offer on this amendment will provide for exemption of the Public Health Service, during 1952, from the personnel ratio limitation agreed upon, in view of special circumstances existing in that Service. It will be expected, however, that the Service and the Agency will on their own take steps to improve the existing ratio before the 1953 budget is considered. At that time, the committees expect to fully examine into the matter as regards the Service with view to determining the proper relationship between total personnel and employees engaged in personnel work.

Amendment No. 133: Corrects a section number.

JOHN E. FOGARTY,
JOHN J. ROONEY,
CHRISTOPHER C. McGRATH,
WINFIELD K. DENTON,
CLARENCE CANNON,
GEO. B. SCHWABE,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following letter, which was read by the Clerk:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., August 15, 1951.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby submit my resignation as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

VERA BUCHANAN,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 392).
The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 392

Resolved, That VERA BUCHANAN, of Pennsylvania, be, and she is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAINTENANCE OF CANAL AND RAILROAD BRIDGES FROM CAPE MAY HARBOR TO DELAWARE BAY

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4055) to authorize for an additional 2-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and bridges over such canal.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, who is on that committee on this side of the aisle?

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi that this bill has been approved and cleared by both the majority and minority leadership of the House and the appropriate committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the paragraph relating to the New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway in the first section of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes," approved July 24, 1946 (Public Law 525, 79th Cong.), is amended by striking out "5 years" and inserting in lieu thereof "7 years."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to authorize for an additional 1-year period the use of rivers and harbors appropriations for maintenance of the canal from Cape May Harbor to Delaware Bay and the railroad and highway bridges over such canal."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "seven" and insert "six."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, Subcommittee No. 3 of the Small Business Committee has under investigation the production and distribution of steel. I ask unanimous consent that that subcommittee may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 388 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one day, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered, as ordered on the bill

and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McCORMACK: On page 1, line 11, strike out "one day" and insert "four hours."

The amendment was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 162]

Albert	Elston	Morrison
Allen, Ill.	Engle	Morton
Allen, La.	Fallon	Murray, Wis.
Andresen	Feighan	O'Konski
August H.	Fisher	Powell
Armstrong	Gamble	Preston
Barrett	Carmatz	Rivers
Beall	Gordon	Sabath
Bennett, Mich.	Gore	Sadlak
Boggs, La.	Gwinn	Saylor
Boykin	Hall	Scott
Breen	Edwin Arthur	Hugh D., Jr.
Brehm	Hays, Ohio	Sheppard
Buckley	Hébert	Smith, Kans.
Buffett	Hedrick	Stockman
Busbey	Hess	Taber
Chatham	Hinshaw	Vinson
Chudoff	Holfield	Welch
Coudert	Hunter	Werdel
Davis, Tenn.	Jarman	Wheeler
Dawson	Jonison	Whitaker
DeGraffenried	Kearns	Wilson, Tex.
Dingell	McDonough	Winstead
Durham	McGregor	Wood, Ga.
Eberharter	Mason	Yorty
Ellsworth	Miller, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 356 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Intergovernment Relations of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments may have permission to sit during the session of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 388 makes in order the consideration of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 recently reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The rule is an open one, waiving all points of order, and, therefore, Members will have the opportunity to offer such amendments as they may see fit.

I have the feeling, Mr. Speaker, that most of the Members have to an extent made up their minds as to what they are going to do about this bill and I

Until further notice:

Mr. Abbott with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Irving with Mr. Taber.
Mr. Sabbath with Mr. Towle.
Mr. Bolling with Mr. Werdel.
Mr. Thomas with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. Chatham with Mr. Buffett.
Mr. Vinson with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Lucas with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. deGraffenried with Mr. Mason.
Mr. McCarthy with Mr. Morton.
Mr. Engle with Mr. O'Konski.
Mr. Machrowicz with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Sadlak.
Mr. Albert with Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Allen of Louisiana with Mr. Stockman.
Mr. Fisher with Mr. Smith of Kansas.
Mr. Gordon with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Granahan with Mr. Elston.
Mr. Breen with Mr. Ellsworth.

Messrs. MURPHY, BYRNE of New York, JAVITS, PATTERSON, and WOLVERTON changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 26, line 12, insert:

"COOPERATIVE RANGE IMPROVEMENTS"

"For artificial revegetation, construction, and maintenance of range improvements, control of rodents, and eradication of poisonous and noxious plants on national forests, as authorized by section 12 of the Act of April 24, 1950 (Public Law 478), \$700,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the said amendment and before the period, insert "": *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available in any national forest in excess of three times the amount available for such forest from sources (including claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, and receipts under 16 U. S. C. 500) other than Federal sources."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: Page 33, line 6, strike out "That hereafter appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof may be reimbursed from non-administrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the cost of classing or grading any such commodity for producers who are eligible to obtain Commodity Credit Corporation price support" and insert "That hereafter there may be transferred to appropriations available for classing or grading any agricultural commodity without charge to the producers thereof such sums from non-administrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation as may be necessary in addition to other funds available for these purposes, such transfers to be reimbursed from subsequent appropriations therefor."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 60: Page 51, line 25, strike out "\$15,000,000" and insert "\$16,500,000."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$16,500,000 (and the amount in the last proviso in this paragraph is increased to \$2,500,000)."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 64, line 13, insert:

"SEC. 410. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to 115, or a part thereof, full time, part time, and intermittent employees of the Department and its instrumentalities, cooperators, and collaborators receiving personnel services from the Department: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this section shall be construed as permitting any increase whatever in personnel officers over and above the number otherwise provided for in this act."

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of August 16, 1951.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, this is the same report that was brought back about 6 weeks ago.

We have followed the instructions of the House by returning to conference and, in conference yesterday, agreeing on the same formula for the Jensen amendment that was adopted in the Interior and Agricultural appropriation bills today.

I yield now to my distinguished friend, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SCHWABE].

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, my chairman has correctly stated the situation. The report is unanimous. As far as I know there is no disagreement, and there is no request for time on this side.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 13, line 16, after "title", insert a colon and the following: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 131: Page 45, line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 705. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only is reduced by the provisions in this act the total number of passenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 705. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only is reduced by the provisions in this act the total number of passenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number: *Provided*, That in no event shall the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be operated during the current fiscal year at the seat of Government under any appropriation or authorization in this act exceed 50 percent of the number in use as of June 30, 1951."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 132: Page 46, line 1, insert the following:

"SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and fifteen, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FOGARTY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, except appropriations for the Public Health Service, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 105, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my congratulations to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and its chairman upon the appointment of a subcommittee to look into the proposed consolidation of the insurance and death-claim activities of the Veterans' Administration. These activities were at one time centralized in the New York office. In 1946, under the direction of Gen. Omar Bradley, one of the ablest Administrators the Veterans' Administration has had, the activities were decentralized and dispersed among several offices for the more efficient service of the veterans. It is now proposed to again centralize the activities, this time in Philadelphia. The space, which

is to be used for this recentralization, had been assigned to the Frankford Arsenal, which is a vital agency of the Army Ordnance Bureau. That agency was preparing to occupy the space last week with an essential defense activity, when it was told that the space was not available because it would be used by the Veterans' Administration for the proposed consolidation.

It is claimed there will be some economy in this change. Last week the Veterans' Administration advertised for 1,000 additional employees in Philadelphia—"experience unnecessary." We feel that this change will not be economical, and it will certainly impair the service which is now being rendered. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], our distinguished floor leader, requested me to express his interest in this inquiry to be made by the Expenditures Committee. He is opposed to the proposed consolidation and believes the committee investigation will show conclusively that it is an improper move.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. HARDY. I commend the gentleman for calling the attention of the House to this matter. I am not chairman of the subcommittee, but I am a member of the committee. I want to assure the gentleman that it is going to be the purpose of that subcommittee to go slowly into this matter and find out first of all, if it is in the interest of efficiency and economy to have any consolidation at all; and secondly, if it infringes upon the defense effort.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I would like to join in the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Virginia and commend him for the interest and activity he has shown in this matter.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. The removal of all these veteran administration offices to Philadelphia will not only discommode and inconvenience veterans who have claims, but it will make it utterly impossible, particularly in death cases, for the dear ones of deceased veterans to get justice because the records will be unavailable and they will not be able to travel great distances to Philadelphia to validate their claims.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. I commend the gentleman on calling the attention of the House to this very important matter. I will serve on this subcommittee, and I assure him I will give it my most careful attention for I recall the last time this change took place, it was months

before any service could be had on questions asked about insurance.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1951

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5113) to maintain the security and promote the foreign policy and provide for the general welfare of the United States by furnishing assistance to friendly nations in the interest of international peace and security.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5113), with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 2, line 22, section 101 (a) subsection (1): Strike out "\$5,028,000,000" and insert "\$4,828,000,000."

On page 3, line 16, strike out "\$1,335,000,000" and insert "\$1,035,000,000."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that my amendment be divided, in order that there may be a separate vote on each of the two subsections. That is, a separate vote on the military cut and a separate vote on the economic cut.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the first portion of the amendment.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is a cut of \$500,000,000; \$200,000,000 on the military end and \$300,000,000 on the economic end in the authorization for Europe.

Now, let us look first at the military side of this. Let me say that in considering any cuts to the bill which this committee has brought to the House, those of us who oppose any further cuts are at a serious disadvantage. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] yesterday said he was tired of voting for large amounts of authorizations without having every penny justified. Let me say we cannot justify, penny for penny and dollar for dollar, this appropriation because this information is a military secret. We cannot even tell you what amount of money in this military authorization will go to each of the countries involved. For this reason we are at a disadvantage when some Member says, "Let us knock \$200,000,000 off of this." That appeals to the instincts of all of us to try to save money. We are in a difficult position to justify why we oppose such a cut.

First, let me tell you that throughout the entire hearings the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON], the

ness loans outstanding on that date. However, 159 of the outstanding loans were loans over \$500,000 and amounted to more than \$253,000,000. Thus less than 1½ percent of the total number of outstanding business loans amounted to nearly one-half of the total amount of business loans outstanding on March 31, 1951, and it is in the "large loan area" that the committee believes the Corporation's lending authority should be reconsidered by the Congress for the protection of the taxpayer and the public.

Several important administrative improvements have been made which the committee feels will create a much healthier atmosphere in and around the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and regain the confidence of the general public. The public interest is being made a condition precedent to all loans, full publicity is being given to all successful loan applicants, employment of its personnel by borrowers has been prohibited, and last but not least some employees have been dismissed because of the "impropriety" of their actions.

As commendable as these actions are, the committee nevertheless believes that these and other changes should be enacted into law to make them fully effective. The committee feels very strongly that the control over the Corporations' activities should be strengthened by amending present law to prohibit the Corporation from sharing responsibility for certain types of loans with other Government agencies. This would centralize the authority to make such loans and should free the Corporation from the severe criticism it might otherwise receive in connection with some of these loans.

The committee is likewise convinced that the financial structure of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should be substantially revised. The Corporation is presently capitalized at \$100,000,000 with funds supplied by the Treasury, and in addition has an authorized lending authority of \$1,243,000,000.

The committee supports the view of the Comptroller General and the Hoover Commission task force on Federal lending that the capital fund and lending authority should be terminated by the Congress and the Corporation financed by a revolving fund made available through appropriations. This would definitely put all of the Corporation's lending programs under the scrutiny of the appropriations committees of both Houses of the Congress, and would place the Corporation's activities more directly under the control of the Congress than they are at the present time. A case in point is the proposal of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to lend money to the States and their political subdivisions for the construction of bomb shelters. The Congress denied funds for this purpose in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951. On March 16, 1951, the Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration testified that his agency would emphasize the shoring up of existing buildings "instead of digging a hole in the ground and filling it up with concrete." He estimated the cost of protecting 1 percent of the population would amount to \$3,000,000,000 if the people were put into deep community shelters and to fully protect the entire population would cost about \$300,000,000,000, which he termed fantastic because there is not enough labor, steel, and concrete in the country to do it. Under these circumstances the committee does not think that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should lend money for the construction of bomb shelters, certainly not until a national policy concerning the construction of bomb shelters has been determined by the Congress.

The committee is not at all satisfied with the present relationship between the Washington office and the field offices. There are several important reasons for this feeling of dissatisfaction, the most recent being the

Corporation's action of June 27, 1951, rescinding the long-standing authority of agency managers in the field to approve loans up to \$100,000 and requiring all loans except disaster loans to be approved in Washington. The reason given for this order was to assure uniformity of actions under the Corporation's new lending policy outlined in Bulletin No. 2101. (See p. 72 of the hearings.) While the committee agrees there must be a uniform operating policy within the Reconstruction Finance Corporation it does not agree that this is the way to accomplish this objective. Unquestionably the Washington office is finding it difficult to coordinate its actions with those of its field offices not only in the instance cited here but also in such important matters as budgeting, financial reporting and record keeping. Therefore, the committee directs the Administrator to make a detailed study of the Corporation's field organization and operation, placing special emphasis on the field relationships with the Washington office and submit a complete report on his findings and recommendations to the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, prior to the hearings on the Corporation's 1953 budget estimate.

Program high lights

[In millions of dollars]

	1940 actual	1951 esti- mate	1952 esti- mate
Business loans:			
(Commitments (Direct business loans).....	299.0	109.0	289.0
Disbursements.....	234.8	501.4	318.0
Repayments.....	94.9	218.8	125.0
Outstanding at June 1.....	444.3	416.1	594.1
Net profit for the year (lending operations).....	19.8	5.3	6.1
Synthetic rubber program:			
Cost of operations.....	155.6	282.6	508.5
Sales.....	156.0	303.5	517.5
Tin program:			
Cost of operations.....	152.1	86.0	125.8
Sales.....	141.2	110.2	126.0

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the individual views of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], who unfortunately cannot be present, regarding the minority views of the subcommittee on the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, be printed and made a part of the report which I have just submitted to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952— CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 16, 1951, pp. 10409-10411.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 3973, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,

August 17, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 42 and 67 to the bill (H. R. 3973) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$2,700,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the matter inserted by the said amendment and before the period, insert: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available in any national forest in excess of three times the amount available for such forest from sources (including claims recognized by the act of December 29, 1950, and receipts under 16 U. S. C. 500) other than Federal sources."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert "\$16,500,000 (and the amount in the last proviso in this paragraph is increased to \$2,500,000)."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21, 30, and 60.

The motion was agreed to.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1922—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read.

(For conference report see House proceedings of August 16, 1951, pp. 10346-10350.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the

Senate to House bill 3709, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
August 17, 1951.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 131, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 705. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only is reduced by the provisions in this act the total number of passenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number: *Provided*, That in no event shall the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be operated during the current fiscal year at the seat of government under any appropriation or authorization in this act exceed 50 percent of the number in use as of June 30, 1951."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"Sec. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, except appropriations for the Public Health Service, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of 1 such employee to 105, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 131 and 132.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Just what business was transacted a moment ago?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Action was taken on the conference report on the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill. There was only one disagreement which amounted to anything, and that was with respect to the so-called Jensen amendment, to which both Houses agreed in a modified form.

Mr. WHERRY. Did the conferees sign a unanimous report?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They certainly did. The report is signed by the conferees on the part of the House and the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. The reason I ask the question is that it was my understanding that there was a question with respect to removing the limitations on personal services in several instances.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The so-called Jensen amendment was reported in disagree-

ment. The form in which it was finally agreed to represented partly the Jensen amendment and partly the Ferguson amendment. The following is the form in which the amendment with respect to personnel, about which the Senator from Nebraska is speaking, was agreed to. Section 706, as agreed to, reads as follows:

Sec. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, except appropriations for the Public Health Service, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

The conferees agreed on that language, but it had to be taken back to the House because of a technical disagreement. Later the House agreed to it.

Mr. WHERRY. The amendments to which I referred were amendments numbered 13, 20, 23, 25, 26, and so forth.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The amendments to which the Senator refers have to do with public health items, and the conferees were in complete agreement on those.

Mr. WHERRY. I have no objection.

MINORITY VIEWS OF SUBCOMMITTEE ON RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk minority views signed by myself and the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. The views are entitled "Minority Final Report of the Subcommittee on Reconstruction Finance Corporation of the Committee on Banking and Currency, Pursuant to Senate Resolution 219, Eighty-first Congress." I ask that the minority views be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; gladly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Am I to understand that the views submitted by the Senator from Indiana are to be made a part of the document to which I have just referred?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes. I am glad the Senator from Arkansas has called my attention to that fact. I should like to state my understanding of the vote in the subcommittee. A majority report has been filed. I now file my minority views. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] has filed his individual views. Other Senators are given an opportunity, until Thursday noon, to file individual views or minority views. The

majority report, the minority views, and the individual views will be printed as one document. That, I believe, is exactly in line with the vote of the subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I was handed this morning, for the first time, the individual views of the junior Senator from Connecticut, I ask unanimous consent to answer his individual views. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my answer be printed as a part of the official document to which reference has been made, as though I had filed the reply with the Senate as a part of my minority views.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the request of the Senator from Indiana, or the significance of it.

Mr. CAPEHART. I hold in my hand the individual views of the Senator from Connecticut, which were filed with the Senate today. They will be printed as a part of the document containing the majority report and the minority views of the committee. I am asking that my remarks in respect to the individual views of the Senator from Connecticut be likewise printed as part of the document.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not certain whether such a request is in accord with the agreement of the members of the committee. It would be in the nature of surrebuttal, it seems to me. As I recall the action of the committee, additional views were to be limited to individual views and minority views.

Mr. CAPEHART. I should think that what I was about to state would be by my individual views.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no personal objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana, but it would seem to me that there would have to be some limit placed on the number of individual views which may be printed as a part of the document.

Mr. CAPEHART. I believe no limit has been placed on the number of individual views which may be filed up to Thursday noon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator has reference to individual views with respect to the minority views. The minority views had been made available to the committee late on Thursday. I am not clear whether the request of the Senator from Indiana is in accord with the vote of the committee on that subject.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then I shall withdraw my request, and I shall talk upon the subject. In that way my views will go into the RECORD. Subsequently I shall file my individual views, which will be made a part of the complete report, as I have a right to do, provided I do so before Thursday noon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not wish to be put in the position of objecting to the request of the Senator from Indiana. I am trying to clarify the effect of the vote of the subcommittee. I do not wish to object to the request of the Senator from Indiana. I am only stating that I am not clear with respect to my understanding of the vote of the committee in that respect. I believe the staff of the committee should be consulted.

Public Law 134 - 82d Congress

Chapter 373 - 1st Session

H. R. 3709

AN ACT

Making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this title referred to as the Secretary), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; teletype news service; and payment in advance when authorized by the Secretary for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; \$1,350,000.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$1,600,000.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards: For expenses necessary for the promotion of industrial safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry; performance of safety functions of the Secretary under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 784 (c)); performance of the functions vested in the Secretary by title I of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 159 (f) and (g)); and not to exceed \$75,000 for the work of the President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, as authorized by the Act of July 11, 1949 (63 Stat. 409), including purchase of reports and of material for informational exhibits; and expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Bureau of Labor Standards; \$688,000, of which not more than \$604,870 shall be available for personal services.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights: For expenses necessary to render assistance in connection with the exercise of reemployment rights of veterans under section 8 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 308), the Service Extension Act of 1941, as amended, the Army Reserve and Retired Personnel Service Law of 1940, as amended, and section 9 (h) of title I of the Selective Service Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C., App. 459 (h)), and, under the Act of June 23, 1943, as amended (50 U. S. C., App. 1472), of persons who have performed service in the Merchant Marine, \$265,758, of which not more than \$213,603 shall be available for personal services.

BUREAU OF APPRENTICESHIP

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary to enable the Secretary to conduct a program of encouraging apprentice training, as authorized by the Act of August 16, 1937 (29 U. S. C. 50), \$2,600,000,

of which not more than \$2,188,680 shall be available for personal services.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the general administration of the employment service and unemployment compensation programs, including temporary employment of persons, without regard to the civil service laws, for the farm placement migratory labor program; for cooperation with the United States Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Secretary of State in negotiating and carrying out agreements relating to the employment of foreign agricultural workers, subject to the immigration laws and when necessary to supplement the domestic labor force; and not to exceed \$10,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$5,016,919, of which \$1,300,000 shall be for carrying into effect the provisions of title IV (except section 602) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 and of which not more than \$4,200,000 shall be available for personal services.

Grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration: For grants in accordance with the provisions of the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended (29 U. S. C. 49-49n), for carrying into effect section 602 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, for grants to the States as authorized in title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 501-503), including, upon the request of any State, the purchase of equipment and the payment of rental for space made available to such State in lieu of grants for such purpose, and for necessary expenses in connection with the operation of employment office facilities and services in the District of Columbia, \$164,560,000, of which \$5,000,000 shall be available only to the extent that the Secretary finds necessary to meet increased costs of administration resulting from changes in a State law or increases in the numbers of claims filed and claims paid or salary costs over those upon which the State's basic grant (or the allocation for the District of Columbia) was based, which increased costs of administration cannot be provided for by normal budgetary adjustments: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary in section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act, as amended, the Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State found to be in compliance with the requirements of the Act of June 6, 1933, and, except in the case of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, with the provisions of section 303 of the Social Security Act, as amended, such amounts as he determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of its unemployment compensation law and of its public employment offices: *Provided further*, That such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Department of Labor and the Post Office Department shall be used for the payment, in such manner as said parties may jointly determine, of postage for the transmission of official mail matter in connection with the administration of unemployment compensation systems and employment services by States receiving grants herefrom.

In carrying out the provisions of said Act of June 6, 1933, the provisions of section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act, as amended, relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, shall apply.

None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Bureau of Employment Security for grants-in-aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers and employees of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established

by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under title III of the Social Security Act, as amended, and under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under such title and under such Act of June 6, 1933, to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

BUREAU OF EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary administrative expenses and not to exceed \$46,000 for the Employees' Compensation Board of Appeals, \$1,887,816, of which not more than \$1,618,499 shall be available for personal services, together with not to exceed \$122,000 to be derived from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012).

Employees' compensation fund: For the payment of compensation and other benefits and expenses (except administrative expenses) authorized by law and accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year, including payments to other Federal agencies for medical and hospital services pursuant to agreement approved by the Bureau of Employees' Compensation; continuation of payment of benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the advancement of costs for enforcement of recoveries in third-party cases; the furnishing of medical and hospital services and supplies, treatment, and funeral and burial expenses, including transportation and other expenses incidental to such services, treatment, and burial, for such enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps as were certified by the Director of such Corps as receiving hospital services and treatment at Government expense on June 30, 1943, and who are not otherwise entitled thereto as civilian employees of the United States, and the limitations and authority of the Act of September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 796), shall apply in providing such services, treatment, and expenses in such cases; \$30,000,000, together with not to exceed \$5,000,000 to be derived from the War Claims Fund created by section 13 (a) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U. S. C. 2012) and to be available for payments pursuant to sections 4 (c) and 5 (f) of such Act, which amounts may be accounted for as one fund.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Bureau, including advances or reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, and not to exceed \$15,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$5,371,352, of which not more than \$4,530,755 shall be available for personal services.

Revision of consumers' price index: For expenses necessary to enable the Bureau to complete the revision of the Consumers' Price Index, including temporary employees at rates to be fixed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service and classification laws and the Federal Employees Pay Act of 1945, as amended; and services

as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a) ; \$1,072,825.

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the work of the Women's Bureau, as authorized by the Act of June 5, 1920 (29 U. S. C. 11-16), including purchase of reports and material for informational exhibits, \$379,285, of which not more than \$317,581 shall be available for personal services.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for performing the duties imposed by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, and the Act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, approved June 30, 1936 (41 U. S. C. 38), including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, and for expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and consultants at conferences concerned with the work of the Division, \$8,000,000, of which not more than \$6,859,200 shall be available for personal services.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 102. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field, and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

SEC. 103. Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation in this title may be transferred to any other such appropriation but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 5 per centum by any such transfer: *Provided*, That no such transfer shall be used for creation of new functions within the Department.

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriation Act, 1952".

TITLE II—FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

AMERICAN PRINTING HOUSE FOR THE BLIND

Education of the blind: For carrying out the Act of August 4, 1919, as amended (20 U. S. C. 101), \$115,000.

COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR THE DEAF

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Columbia Institution for the Deaf, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses, and repairs and improvements, \$390,000.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses for carrying out the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 301-392, Public Law 459, approved March 16, 1950); the Tea Importation Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 41-50); the Import Milk Act (21 U. S. C. 141-149); the Federal Caustic Poison Act (15 U. S. C. 401-411); and the Filled Milk Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 61-64); including the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles, of which two shall be for replacement only; reporting and illustrating the results of

investigations; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; not to exceed \$2,000 for payment in advance for special tests and analyses by contract; and payment of fees, travel, and per diem in connection with studies of new developments pertinent to food and drug enforcement operations; \$5,300,000, of which not more than \$4,361,900 shall be available for personal services.

Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services: For expenses necessary for the certification or inspection of certain products in accordance with sections 406, 504, 506, 507, 604, 702A, and 706 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended (21 U. S. C. 346, 354, 356, 357, 364, 372a, and 376), the aggregate of the advance deposits during the current fiscal year to cover payment of fees by applicants for certification or inspection of such products, to remain available until expended. The total amount herein appropriated shall be available for personal services; purchase of chemicals, apparatus, and scientific equipment; and the refund of advance deposits for which no service has been rendered.

FREEDMEN'S HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for operation and maintenance, including repairs; purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel used by employees in the performance of their official duties; transfer of funds to the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Howard University" for salaries of technical and professional personnel detailed to the hospital; payments to the appropriation of Howard University for instruction of nurses and actual cost of heat, light, and power furnished by such university; \$2,631,500: *Provided*, That no intern or resident physician receiving compensation from this appropriation on a full-time basis shall receive compensation in the form of wages or salary from any other appropriation in this title: *Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Salaries and expenses: For the partial support of Howard University, including personal services and miscellaneous expenses and repairs to buildings and grounds, \$2,475,000.

Plans and specifications: For the preparation of plans and specifications for construction, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, on the grounds of Howard University of a pharmacy building, including engineering and architectural services, advertising, and travel, \$55,500, to remain available until expended.

Construction of buildings: For construction of buildings on the grounds of Howard University, under the supervision of the General Services Administration, to remain available until expended, as follows:

For construction of a pharmacy building, together with alterations and installations in connection with such construction, including engineering and architectural services, and travel, \$904,500;

For payment of obligations incurred under authority provided under this head in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1948, as amended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1949, to enter into contracts for construction of an engineering building, \$332,000.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Promotion and further development of vocational education: For carrying out the provisions of section 3 of the Vocational Education Act of 1946 (20 U. S. C. 15), section 4 of the Act of March 10, 1924 (20 U. S. C. 29), and section 1 of the Act of March 3, 1931 (20 U. S. C. 30) and the Act of March 18, 1950 (Public Law 462), \$19,123,261: *Provided*, That the apportionment to the States under the Vocational Education Act of 1946 shall be computed on the basis of not to exceed \$18,948,261 for the current fiscal year: *Provided further*, That not more than \$900,000 of this appropriation shall be available for vocational education in distributive occupations.

Further endowment of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts: For carrying out the provisions of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935 (7 U. S. C. 329), \$2,480,000.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of Education, including surveys, studies, investigations, and reports regarding libraries; fostering coordination of public and school library service; coordination of library service on the national level with other forms of adult education; developing library participation in Federal projects; fostering Nation-wide coordination of research materials among libraries, interstate library coordination and the development of library service throughout the country; purchase, distribution, and exchange of educational documents, motion-picture films, and lantern slides; collection, exchange, and cataloging of educational apparatus and appliances, articles of school furniture and models of school buildings illustrative of foreign and domestic systems and methods of education, and repairing the same; \$3,397,706, of which not more than \$2,893,577 shall be available for personal services, and of which not less than \$500,000 shall be available for the Division of Vocational Education as authorized: *Provided*, That all receipts from non-Federal agencies representing reimbursement for expenses of travel of employees of the Office of Education performing advisory functions to said agencies shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of this appropriation.

Payments to school districts: For payments to local educational agencies for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874), \$40,000,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall also be available for carrying out the provisions of section 6 of such Act.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

For providing school facilities and for grants to local educational agencies in federally affected areas, as authorized by title II of the Act of September 23, 1950 (Public Law 815), to remain available until expended, \$75,000,000, of which \$25,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority granted for the foregoing purpose in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1951.

OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico): For payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico) in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (29 U. S. C., ch. 4), including payments, in accordance with regulations of the Administrator, for one-half of necessary expenditures for the acquisition of vending stands or other equipment in accordance with section 3 (a) (3) (C) of said Act for the use of blind persons, such stands or other equipment to be controlled by the State agency, \$21,500,000, of which not to exceed \$175,000 shall be available to the Federal Security Administrator for providing rehabilitation services to disabled residents of the District of Columbia, as authorized by section 6 of said Act, which latter amount shall be available for administrative expenses in connection with providing such services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 per centum of the appropriation shall be used for administrative purposes.

Payments to States (including Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico), next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (including the objects specified in the preceding paragraph), for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year: *Provided*, That the payments made pursuant to this paragraph shall not exceed the amount paid to the States for the first quarter of the current fiscal year.

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, and of the Act approved June 20, 1936 (20 U. S. C., ch. 6A), including not to exceed \$3,000 for production, purchase, and distribution of educational films; \$675,620, of which not more than \$558,220 shall be available for personal services.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

For necessary expenses in carrying out the Public Health Service Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 6A) (hereinafter referred to as the Act), and other Acts, including (with the exception of the appropriation "Pay, and so forth, commissioned officers, Public Health Service") purchase of reports, documents, and other material for publication; preparation and display of posters and exhibits by contract or otherwise; packing, unpacking, crating, uncrating, drayage, and transportation of personal effects of commissioned officers and transportation of their dependents on change of station; and increased allowances to Reserve officers for foreign service; as follows:

Venereal diseases: To carry out the purposes of sections 314 (a) and 363 of the Act with respect to venereal diseases including the operation and maintenance of centers for the diagnosis, treatment, support, and clothing of persons afflicted with venereal diseases; transportation and subsistence of such persons and their attendants to and from the place of treatment or allowance in lieu thereof; diagnosis and treatment (including emergency treatment for other illnesses) of such persons through contracts with physicians and hospitals and other appropriate institutions; fees for case finding and referral to such centers of voluntary patients; reasonable expenses of preparing remains or burial of deceased patients; recreational supplies and equipment; leasing of facilities and repair and alteration of leased facilities; the purchase of not to exceed seven passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, and for grants of money, services,

supplies, equipment, and use of facilities to States, as defined in the Act, and with the approval of the respective State health authorities, to counties, health districts, and other political subdivisions of the States, for the foregoing purposes, in such amounts and upon such terms and conditions as the Surgeon General may determine; \$11,653,360.

Tuberculosis: To carry out the purposes of section 314 (b) of the Act, \$8,745,000.

Assistance to States, general: To carry out the purposes of section 314 (c) of the Act; to provide consultative services to States pursuant to section 311 of the Act; to make field investigations and demonstrations pursuant to section 301 of the Act; and to provide for collecting and compiling mortality, morbidity, and vital statistics (including procurement by contract of transcripts of State, municipal, and other records), including the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$15,960,000.

Communicable diseases: To carry out, except as otherwise provided for, those provisions of sections 301, 311, 361, and 704 of the Act relating to the prevention and suppression of communicable and preventable diseases, and the interstate transmission and spread thereof, including the purchase, erection, and maintenance of portable buildings; the purchase of not to exceed ten passenger motor vehicles and two aircraft for replacement only; and hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; \$5,915,747.

Engineering, sanitation, and industrial hygiene: For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary to carry out those provisions of sections 301, 311, and 361 of the Act relating to sanitation and other aspects of environmental health, including enforcement of applicable quarantine laws and interstate quarantine regulations, and for carrying out the purposes of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)), including purchase of not to exceed four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$3,648,158.

Grants, water pollution control: For grants to carry out section 8 (a) of the Water Pollution Control Act (33 U. S. C. 466-466 (j)), \$900,000, to remain available until expended.

Disease and sanitation investigations and control, Territory of Alaska: To enable the Surgeon General to conduct, in the Service, and to cooperate with and assist the Territory of Alaska in the conduct of, activities necessary in the investigation, prevention, treatment, and control of diseases, and the establishment and maintenance of health and sanitation services pursuant to and for the purposes specified in sections 301, 311, 314 (without regard to the provisions of subsections (d), (f), (h), and (j) and the limitations set forth in subsection (c) of such section), 361, 363, and 704 of the Act, including the purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, and hire, operation, and maintenance of aircraft, \$1,211,129: *Provided*, That property of the Public Health Service located in Alaska and used in carrying out the activities herein authorized may be transferred, without reimbursement, to the Territory of Alaska at the discretion of the Surgeon General.

Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio: For payment of obligations incurred pursuant to authority granted under the head "Buildings and facilities, Cincinnati, Ohio," General Services Administration, in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1951, \$2,400,000, to remain available until expended.

Grants for hospital construction: For payments for hospital construction under part C, title VI, of the Act, as amended, to remain available until expended, \$182,500,000, of which \$100,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head: *Provided*, That allotments under such part C to the

several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of an amount equal to that part of the appropriation granted herein which is available for new obligations.

Salaries and expenses, hospital construction services: For salaries and expenses incident to carrying out title VI of the Act, as amended, including the purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$1,166,465.

Hospitals and medical care: For carrying out the functions of the Public Health Service under the Act of August 8, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 150), and under sections 321, 322, 324, 326, 331, 332, 341, 343, 344, 502, 504, and 710 of the Public Health Service Act, and Executive Order 9079 of February 26, 1942, including purchase and exchange of farm products and livestock; purchase of not to exceed nine passenger motor vehicles, including four ambulances, for replacement only; and firearms and ammunition; \$30,200,000: *Provided*, That when the Public Health Service establishes or operates a health service program for any department or agency, payment for the estimated cost shall be made in advance for deposit to the credit of this appropriation.

Foreign quarantine service: For carrying out the purposes of sections 361 to 369 of the Act, relating to preventing the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign countries, the medical examination of aliens in accordance with section 325 of the Act, and the care and treatment of quarantine detainees pursuant to section 322 (e) of the Act in private or other public hospitals when facilities of the Public Health Service are not available, including insurance of official motor vehicles in foreign countries when required by law of such countries; and the purchase of not to exceed five passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$2,900,000.

National Institutes of Health, operating expenses: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowships and grants for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the Act; the regulation and preparation of biologic products; the purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of adrenocorticotrophic hormone (ACTH), cortisone, and other chemical substances, and for development of other related compounds; \$15,500,000.

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon General, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing consultative services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid; for the purchase of not to exceed two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the Act; \$19,500,000, of which not less than \$4,625,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for research and training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

Mental health activities: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of sections 301, 302, 303, 311, 312, and 314 (c) of the Act with respect to mental diseases, \$10,518,987, of which not less than \$573,000 shall be available exclusively for payment of obligations for research and training grants incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

National Heart Institute: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Heart Act, including the purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, \$10,000,000.

Dental health activities: For expenses not otherwise provided for, necessary to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of the Act with respect to dental diseases and conditions, \$1,598,654.

Construction of research facilities: For construction of research facilities, to be transferred (except such part as may be necessary for incidental expenses and purchase of equipment by the Public Health Service) to the General Services Administration, and to remain available until expended, as follows:

For continuation of construction of a combined hospital and research building as authorized under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Acts of 1949 and 1950, \$10,400,000, of which \$10,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted under this head.

For payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of auxiliary service area structures, as authorized under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1950, \$300,000.

For payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for construction of additional auxiliary structures as authorized under this head in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1951, \$350,000.

For purchase and installation of additional equipment, supplies, and furnishings for structures heretofore provided under this head, \$6,635,540.

Commissioned officers, pay, and so forth: For pay, uniforms and subsistence allowances, increased allowances for foreign service and commutation of quarters for not to exceed one thousand five hundred regular active commissioned officers; for medals, decorations, and retired pay of regular and reserve commissioned officers; for payment of claims for private property lost, destroyed, captured, abandoned, or damaged in the military service of the United States, as authorized by law (31 U. S. C. 222c, h; 42 U. S. C. 213); and for six months' death gratuity pay and burial payments for regular commissioned officers; \$1,861,500, and the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from appropriations made available to the Public Health Service for the current fiscal year such additional amounts as may be necessary for pay and allowances of the officers herein authorized.

Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere, including conducting research on technical nursing standards and furnishing consultative nursing services; preparing information, articles, and publications related to public health; conducting studies and demonstrations in public health methods; carrying on international health activities, including not to exceed \$1,000 for entertainment of officials of other countries when specifically authorized by the Surgeon General; and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; \$2,745,868.

SAINT ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the hospital, including purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only, clothing for patients and cooperation with organizations or individuals in scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention, and treatment of mental illness, \$2,135,000.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction, \$136,500, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Federal Credit Unions: For expenses necessary for the supervision of Federal credit unions, \$175,000, together with the aggregate of amounts received from certificate, supervision, and examination fees collected from Federal credit unions as authorized by law, of which total sum not more than \$626,671 shall be available for personal services.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance: For necessary expenses, including purchase of two passenger motor vehicles; and furnishing, repairing, and cleaning of wearing apparel and equipment used by building guards; not more than \$58,000,000 may be expended from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, of which not more than \$49,549,400 shall be available for personal services.

Reimbursement to Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: For reimbursement to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund for administrative costs and for benefits paid during the period July 1, 1949 through August 31, 1950 to the survivors of veterans of World War II eligible for benefits as provided under section 210 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 410), \$3,734,000.

Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. I, IV, and X, 64 Stat. 477), \$1,150,000,000, of which such amount as may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year.

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance: For expenses necessary for the Bureau of Public Assistance, \$1,600,000, of which not more than \$1,455,400 shall be available for personal services.

Salaries and expenses, Children's Bureau: For necessary expenses in carrying out the Act of April 9, 1912, as amended (29 U. S. C. 18a), and title V of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), including purchase of reports and material for the publications of the Children's Bureau and of reprints for distribution, \$1,500,000, of which not more than \$1,238,900 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That no part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to promulgate or carry out any instructions, order, or regulation relating to the care of obstetrical cases which discriminate between persons licensed under State law to practice obstetrics: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not be so construed as to prevent any patient from having the services of any practitioner of her own choice, paid for out of this fund, so long as State laws are complied with: *Provided further*, That any State plan which provides standards for professional obstetrical services in accordance with the laws of the State shall be approved.

Grants to States for maternal and child welfare: For grants to States for maternal and child-health services, services for crippled children, and child-welfare services as authorized in title V, parts

1, 2, and 3, of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subch. V), \$31,500,000: *Provided*, That any allotment to a State pursuant to section 502 (b) or 512 (b) of such Act shall not be included in computing for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b) of sections 504 and 514 of such Act an amount expended or estimated to be expended by the State.

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Commissioner: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Commissioner for Social Security, \$200,000, together with not to exceed \$110,300 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Grants to States, next succeeding fiscal year: For making, after May 31 of the current fiscal year, payments to States under titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, for the first quarter of the next succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary, the obligations incurred and the expenditures made thereunder for payments under each of such titles to be charged to the appropriation therefor for that fiscal year.

In the administration of titles I, IV, V, X, and XIV, respectively, of the Social Security Act, as amended, payments to a State under any of such titles for any quarter in the period beginning April 1 of the prior year, and ending June 30 of the current year, may be made with respect to a State plan approved under such title prior to or during such period, but no such payment shall be made with respect to any plan for any quarter prior to the quarter in which such plan was submitted for approval.

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries, Office of the Administrator: Salaries, Office of the Administrator, \$2,050,000, together with not to exceed \$403,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund: *Provided*, That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to finance the regional office activities of such constituent organizations.

Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Administrator, including salaries for the Division of Service Operations; and purchase of one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only; \$711,500, together with not to exceed \$123,500 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund, of which total sum not more than \$402,045 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That the Administrator may advance to this appropriation from appropriations of constituent organizations of the Federal Security Agency such sums as may be necessary to cover the charges for services, supplies, equipment, and materials furnished.

Salaries, Office of the General Counsel: Salaries, Office of the General Counsel, \$396,478, together with not to exceed \$22,950 to be transferred from the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, certification and inspection services", and not to exceed \$389,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Surplus property disposal: For expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of subsections 203 (j) and (k) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, relating to disposal of real and personal excess property for educational purposes and protection of public health, \$90,000.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 202. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for examination of estimates of appropriations in the field, and for payment in advance when authorized by the Federal Security Administrator for dues or fees for library membership in organizations whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public.

SEC. 203. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a).

SEC. 204. Appropriations under this title available for salaries and expenses shall be available for travel expenses and for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the function or activity for which any such appropriation is made.

SEC. 205. None of the funds appropriated by this title to the Social Security Administration for grants in aid of State agencies to cover, in whole or in part, the cost of operation of said agencies including the salaries and expenses of officers and employes of said agencies, shall be withheld from the said agencies of any States which have established by legislative enactment and have in operation a merit system and classification and compensation plan covering the selection, tenure in office, and compensation of their employees, because of any disapproval of their personnel or the manner of their selection by the agencies of the said States, or the rates of pay of said officers or employees.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1952".

TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$8,233,959, of which not more than \$6,622,284 shall be available for personal services: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the Act of July 5, 1935 (49 Stat. 450), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the Act of June 25, 1938 (52 Stat. 1060).

This title may be cited as the "National Labor Relations Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

TITLE IV—NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Mediation Board, including stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$394,247, of which not more than \$299,307 shall be available for personal services.

Arbitration and emergency boards: For expenses necessary for arbitration boards established under section 7 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended (45 U. S. C. 157), and emergency boards appointed

by the President pursuant to section 10 of said Act (45 U. S. C. 160), including stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$144,000, of which not more than \$114,000 shall be available for personal services.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Railroad Adjustment Board, including stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), \$600,000, of which not more than \$460,774 shall be available for personal services and of which not less than \$250,000 shall be available for compensation (at rates not in excess of \$75 per diem) and expenses of referees appointed pursuant to section 3 of the Railway Labor Act, as amended.

This title may be cited as the "National Mediation Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

TITLE V—RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Payment to railroad retirement account: For an annual premium to provide for the payment of all annuities, pensions, and death benefits, in accordance with the provisions of the Railroad Retirement Acts of 1935 and 1937, as amended (45 U. S. C. 228-228s), and for expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board in the Administration of said Acts as specifically provided for under this title, for crediting to the railroad retirement account, an amount equal to amounts covered into the Treasury (minus refunds) during the current fiscal year under the Railroad Retirement Tax Act (28 U. S. C. 1500-1538).

Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund): For expenses necessary for the Railroad Retirement Board, including not to exceed \$1,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Board; and stenographic reporting services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$5,056,904, of which not more than \$4,010,820 shall be available for personal services, to be derived from the railroad retirement account.

This title may be cited as the "Railroad Retirement Board Appropriation Act, 1952".

TITLE VI—FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Service to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 171-180, 182), including expenses of the Labor-Management Panel as provided in section 205 of said Act; temporary employment of arbitrators, conciliators, and mediators on labor relations at rates not in excess of \$50 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with labor and industrial relations; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); \$3,047,000, of which not more than \$2,566,653 shall be available for personal services.

Boards of inquiry: To enable the Service to pay necessary expenses of boards of inquiry appointed by the President pursuant to section 206 of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 176-180, 182), including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), and rent in the District of Columbia,

\$48,750, of which not more than \$23,750 shall be available for personal services.

This title may be cited as the "Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service Appropriation Act, 1952".

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit has not contrary to the provisions of this section engaged in a strike against the Government of the United States, is not a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or that such person does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who engages in a strike against the Government of the United States or who is a member of an organization of Government employees that asserts the right to strike against the Government of the United States, or who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this Act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

SEC. 702. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not heretofore authorized by the Congress.

SEC. 703. No part of any appropriation or authorization contained in this Act shall be used to pay the compensation of any incumbent appointed to any civil office or position which may become vacant during the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 1951: *Provided*, That this inhibition shall not apply—

- (a) to not to exceed 25 per centum of all vacancies;
- (b) to positions filled from within and by transfer to the department or agency;
- (c) to offices or positions required by law to be filled by appointment of the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate;
- (d) to Saint Elizabeths Hospital and Freedmen's Hospital;
- (e) to the Public Health Service;
- (f) to educational institutions; and
- (g) to personnel engaged in law enforcement: *Provided further*, That when the total number of personnel subject to this section has been reduced to 90 per centum of the total provided for in the budget estimates for 1952, this section may cease to apply.

SEC. 704. Amounts available from appropriations and other funds in this Act, and amounts specified therein for personal services, are hereby reduced in the sums hereinafter set forth, such sums (except

trust funds) to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury immediately upon the approval of this Act, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Labor Standards, \$31,835;

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Salaries and expenses, \$238,461;

WOMEN'S BUREAU

Salaries and expenses, \$16,715;

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Salaries and expenses, \$152,293;

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

Salaries and expenses, Division of Service Operations:

Appropriation, \$17,487;

Transfer from Old-age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund,
\$3,673;

Salaries, Office of the General Counsel:

Appropriation, \$21,350;

Transfer from Old-age and Survivors' Insurance Trust Fund,
\$21,197;

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses, \$348,541;

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Salaries and expenses, \$15,753;

Arbitration and emergency boards, \$6,000;

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses, \$24,251;

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Salaries and expenses, Railroad Retirement Board (trust fund),
\$211,096;

FEDERAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE

Salaries and expenses, \$135,087;

Boards of inquiry, \$1,250.

SEC. 705. Where the number of passenger cars for replacement only is reduced by the provisions in this Act the total number of passenger cars in the division or department concerned will be reduced by a like number: *Provided*, That in no event shall the number of passenger-carrying vehicles which may be operated during the current fiscal year at the seat of government under any appropriation or authorization

in this Act exceed 50 per centum of the number in use as of June 30, 1951.

SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, except appropriations for the Public Health Service, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half time or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; training; committees of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting.

SEC. 707. This Act may be cited as the "Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1952".

Approved August 31, 1951.

3 5 4 0 E